

# A PRACTICAL PROGRAMME FOR WORKING MEN.



XVIII. 1. 12.



THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES







A PRACTICAL PROGRAMME FOR  
WORKING MEN



# A PRACTICAL PROGRAMME FOR WORKING MEN



LONDON  
SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO., LIM.  
NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1906



RECORDED TO MRU  
21 MAR 20 17A  
Y8A9811

## PREFACE

THIS book was written before the organisation of the Labour Representation Committee in England, before the entrance of Trade Unions in politics in Russia; and above all, before the large vote cast in Chicago and New York in favour of public ownership. This last may indicate that the proletariat in America is no longer asleep, and has awakened to the issues which most vitally interest it. The question remains, however, whether the vote in Chicago and New York was deliberately cast in favour of a carefully matured programme, or whether it was not a mere protest against the mismanagement of private corporations, and their corrupt influence on public affairs. If it was a mere protest, it is likely to disappear as soon as public indifference unites with private interest to hush the present clamour. But in either case there is probably as much need for a compendious state-

ment of the problem at issue now as before these elections; there are in the programme of public ownership two questions involved essentially different:

Is public ownership wise to-day?

To what will public ownership lead to-morrow?

The first is a question of expediency, the second one of principle. Both deserve a more careful study than is possible in the heat of a campaign. It has been decided, therefore, to publish this book just as it was written before the election of Mayor Dunne; time only can show whether the late upheaval partakes of the fitful movements of an uneasy sleeper, or whether it is at last the first intelligible utterance of an awakened popular conscience. Should it be but the one the sleeper has still need of a goad, and should it be the other there is still need of counsel, for there will not be lacking men who will strive to appropriate popular indignation to their own use. False science, false economics, false politics, false philanthropy, false philosophy, and false religion are six redoubtable enemies, and nothing in recent events indicates that they have been much or at all assailed, or that the voter has yet fully awakened to the essential principles that should animate political progress. The

object of the following pages is to seek these principles and endeavour to state them.

Amongst the conclusions to which they tend are the following:—

#### ON THE FIELD OF SCIENCE

Human evolution differs essentially from the evolution that preceded man.

Man can and does create his own environment, and through his control over his own environment, can and does determine the direction of his progress.

The environment moulded the animal before man ; since the advent of man, man moulds the environment.

Competition is not the only law of evolution ; Nature has produced finer results through co-operation than through competition. Individualism built on the competitive system observed in Nature is wrong in so far as it ignores the co-operative system equally developed there.

Man can by substituting co-operation for competition in the production and distribution of

necessaries create a new environment that will profoundly modify human character.

#### ON THE FIELD OF ECONOMICS

Competition, long believed to be a boon, has turned out to be the curse of Economics. It was a boon when it put an end to the tyranny of the Guild ; it has become a curse by creating the tyranny of the Market.

Employers are the slaves of the Market because the Market, by keeping down prices, prevents employers from paying high wages even though they would.

Employees are the slaves of the Market because the Market, by competition between employees, keeps down wages.

The necessity of fighting competition has driven working-men to organise Trade Unions which, although indispensable, have given rise to two appalling evils: Hatred between employees by creating the Scab, and hatred between employer and employee by creating the Lock-out and the Strike.



And Trade Unions can never raise wages beyond the limits imposed by the law of supply and demand—the Market.

The law of supply and demand is fatal to economical manufacture and distribution.

Co-operation is cheaper than competition.

#### ON THE FIELD OF POLITICS

The working-man is stronger on the field of Politics than on the field of Economics.

On the field of Politics, numbers are a source of strength, for they can make a majority; on the field of Economics, numbers are a source of weakness, for they lower wages by competition.

Trade Unions can never do more than compel the employer to pay the wages he can afford to pay; competition by keeping down prices prevents the employer paying the working-man the wages to which he is entitled.

On the field of Politics alone can the working-man slowly replace competitive individualistic production by co-operative State production, and thus eliminate the great enemy to his welfare.

The problem of Politics is to find a programme that will unite a majority in favour of measures based on sound principles on the one hand, without being inopportune or inexpedient on the other.

#### ON THE FIELD OF PHILANTHROPY

True Philanthropy is not Charity, but Justice.

The Philanthropy of to-day endeavours to expiate the exploitation of the poor by inadequate relief.

Its aim should be to put a stop to the exploitation that makes relief necessary.

Sound economics can, by introducing co-operation into manufacture and distribution, effect economies that will reduce the necessity of relief to a negligible quantity.

Sound Economics alone can make true Philanthropy possible.

#### ON THE FIELD OF PHILOSOPHY

Man need no longer remain the slave of his greater inclination, for he can create an

environment that will itself determine his greater inclination.

The competitive system sets every man fighting his neighbour and creates an environment of hate. Man can, by substituting co-operation for competition, create an environment of mutual helpfulness and love.

Such a change would modify the prevailing greater inclination.

By his control over the environment, man becomes master of his greater inclination and solves the problem of free will.

By his control over the environment, man can accomplish the promise of Scripture: "Ye are Gods."

#### ON THE FIELD OF RELIGION

It is impossible to reconcile Christianity and the competitive system.

Christianity is the religion of love, and competition is a regime of hate.

Christ preached co-operation and the early Christians practised it.

We can now practise Christianity only by substituting co-operation for competition.

Revolutionary Socialists are to-day appealing to the hatred of Mass against Class.

The answer to revolutionary Socialists is to appeal to the love of Man for Man irrespective of Class.

Revolutionary Socialism means war.

Evolutionary Socialism means peace.

War will substitute one set of masters for another ; peace will eliminate all masters by creating standards of mutual helpfulness. This is the real aim of all sound political effort.

A sound view of Science, Economics, Politics, Philanthropy, Philosophy and Religion, all point to the same result—the slow substitution of co-operation for competition whenever and wherever practically possible.

To the working-man. such a programme means deliverance ; to the rich it means either deliverance or death ; for present conditions furnish to the rich not happiness, but satiety and ennui ; new conditions would rescue them from both by furnishing to every

man opportunity for the healthful exercise of every function; but let the rich beware of indifference: competition is doomed; it may disappear suddenly drowned in a deluge of blood, or slowly through the co-operation of all. The wealthy are to-day as blind to the forces marshalled against them as were the nobles on the eve of the French Revolution; are they prepared to share the same ignoble fate?

There is proposed in this book a Practical Programme which working-men have the most immediate interest to adopt. But the rich have as ultimate an interest to adopt it as the working-men, for indifference will probably result in disorder, whereas such a programme as the one urged herein means Economy, Peace, Justice, and the maximum of happiness for all. It means, too, the creation by Man of an environment that will rescue him from degeneration and lift him to the level of a God.



# CONTENTS

## BOOK I.—THE BOOK OF EXHORTATION

CHAP.						PAGE
I	THE AROUSAL	-	-	-	-	3
II	KNOWLEDGE	-	-	-	-	13
III	MAN	-	-	-	-	18
IV	THE ART OF LIFE	-	-	-	-	22
V	THE ART OF HAPPINESS	-	-	-	-	25

## BOOK II.—THE BOOK OF FACTS

I	ENVIRONMENT	-	-	-	-	31
II	COMPETITION OR CO-OPERATION	-	-	-	-	90
III	THE PRACTICAL PROGRAMME	-	-	-	-	160

## BOOK III.—WISDOM, FAITH, KARITAS

WISDOM	-	-	-	-	-	219
FAITH	-	-	-	-	-	220
KARITAS	-	-	-	-	-	225





Book I

THE BOOK OF EXHORTATION



# A PRACTICAL PROGRAMME

FOR

## WORKING MEN

### CHAPTER I

#### THE AROUSAL

It is time that workers awake.

We have slept long enough, as drugged men sleep.

The world is filled with music, the song of the bird, of running water, of the planets in their awful course.

But man has drowned the music of Nature with noise of his own making: the noise of the factory; the noise of strife; the cry of the children, of the poor, of the oppressed.

Every one of us is beset with his own anxieties, his own wrongs.

We live in a turmoil of our own that deafens us.

But if we choose we can close our ears to the noises of men, and then they will open to the music of Nature; we can in our memories during the

silence of the night travel back to green pastures, to woods and streams; we can lie between the spaces of the sea and sky; we can visit the stars in their heights and in their depths; or in the noisy day we can step out of the crowded street into an empty church and kneel before its empty shrine.

Then will the door of the ears, the heart, and the understanding be opened to the voice of deliverance.

The voice that speaks to us in our hours of sorrow, and bids us take up with courage the burden of every day.

That binds man to man in the struggle against servitude.

That makes hunger and cold easy in the stress of the strike.

That even in defeat tells us there is a way out.

For the day of deliverance is at hand, oh, my brothers.

A power has been given to us that we may, through it, become free.

The world changes and men change.

Two thousand years ago there were no factories; there was no need of Trade Unions.

Two thousand years ago men were lacking in Power.

They lived in terror of Lightning and Flame.

To-day that which they once feared has become their servant.

They run lightning along a little wire, and it obeys them.

They set the flame under a cauldron, and it moves great ships on the sea and great factories on land.

And these two Powers have been Vanity to man ; they have brought neither happiness nor rest.

Rather, indeed, a greater toil and a subtler servitude.

But there is a third Power yet to be added.

Oh, listen, fellow - workers ; this third Power is yours if you will but listen and learn.

This third Power our forefathers have fought for and won ; and you have allowed it to be taken from your hands.

It has been used by craft to set up rulers, and misused to make you slaves.

It has been to us as the lightning and the flame were to our forefathers, who understood them not.

It has served to keep us in bondage.

We may use it now to set us free.

This third Power has cost us in the past blood and treasure.

Our fathers have bled and suffered to make it ours.

And when it became ours, we let it fall from our hands.

We sank into the deadly slumber of the drugged.

Awake, then ; let us take up this weapon.

Let us learn to use it to our own profit,

Nor any longer leave it to the profit of the rich.

You know it well ; it is grown familiar to you ; and because you did not know how to use it, you have neglected and despised it.

So also during thousands of years coal lay hidden away unused in the bowels of the earth.

During thousands of years lightning flashed terribly and ineffectually in the thundering heavens.

Awake, then, at last, and learn the use of the third Power.

For behold the stone which the builders neglected will become the head stone of the corner.

Do not turn aside, oh, my fellow-workers, and say, "We have been told this before, and it is Vanity."

For you are as men that have been drugged—drugged by failure; drugged by error; drugged by despair.

The voice of deliverance awakens you a moment; you lift up your heavy lids, but they wearily close again, and you turn over on the other side.

The Angel of Light comes to you, but you do not know her.

Eyes have you, and see not; ears, and hear not.

And so you turn aside. You sink back into the sleep and the nightmare; into suffering and death.

But you can wake if you will; you have but to arouse yourselves.

It is easier to sleep and suffer; but it is time to awake and resist.

Resist! Ay, how and whom?

Who is our enemy, oh, my brothers? Whom have we to resist and overcome?

In our ignorance we have fought the wrong man.

When jostled in a crowd, we think it is the man nearest who has jostled us.

But it is not his fault; *he is pushed against us by the pressure of the whole crowd.*

If we fight and try to punish him, we err, and we gain nothing, whatever the issue of the fight.

The real enemy is the pressure of the whole crowd.

But who will relax this pressure ?

Who, indeed, when the crowding is due to the effort of every man in the crowd to get air by making room for himself around himself ?

And yet this is how we all live :

We who work feel upon us the pressure of our employers ; and we fight our employers.

Nay ; they too must fight, for they too must breathe and live.

Do these things seem false to you ?

- If they do, be patient till you know more.

It is an old saying : Man is not a sack that he can be emptied in a moment.

If it is true that we have been drugged by error, we must be rid of error before we can altogether awake again.

And error is a cunning master ; for a man in error does not see things as they are.

But if you would be free, you must escape from the bondage of error.

If you would conquer the enemy, you must first learn who is your enemy.

Throw a stone into a group of strange dogs ; the dog who is struck will turn upon the dog that is nearest

him, and all will be set fighting one with another ; no one of them will be to blame, for no one of them knows who threw the stone.

Let us learn first who our enemy is ; then only can we overcome him.

If it can be shown that we are indeed living as a man suffocating in a crowd ; if indeed it be not the fault of the nearest man whose pressure we most feel ; if to fight him can never accomplish more than open out for a moment a small space in the crowd that must necessarily close in again ; if the pressure that bears equally upon our employers and ourselves is altogether unnecessary and evil ; and if we can by intelligent effort relieve the pressure as well for the employer as ourselves, is not this pressure the real enemy we have to conquer ?

And if we have been fighting the wrong man to his misery and to our own, have we not all along erred ? And is not Error, then, the first giant in our path ?

Who, then, is our enemy ?

It is not our employers, whom we unjustly serve.

It is not the rich, who have as little attained happiness as ourselves.

It is not Capital, as we have been wrongly told.

Our first enemy is Ignorance.

And when we have through knowledge conquered ignorance, we shall learn who is our second and greatest enemy, and how this second and greatest enemy can be overcome.



Then will come the day of deliverance.

For we are as blind men in a battle, unable to distinguish friend from foe ; we receive blows and we give them, every man for himself, and the devil for all.

The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong ; the devil takes care of his own.

And so it comes to pass that the multitude needlessly suffers and a few prevail in vain—in vain, for these last neither attain happiness nor escape suffering.

Open your eyes, for ye have eyes if ye would see.

Open your eyes, for though we have many enemies, we have one Friend, one Friend all powerful.

Who is our Friend ?

Bare your heads, oh, my brothers, for we are on holy ground.

Have you, in your sorrow and in your toil, learned to believe no ground is holy ?

You would be wrong.

There is a Power that makes for happiness, and this Power is holy.

So long as we are blinded by error, we cannot see It.

And yet It is visible everywhere.

How did this world come into being—this world that has been made so fair, and man has made so foul ?

Do you ever go into the fields in the spring ? Do you ever see the tender green, the violet and crocus

shoot out of the cold brown earth? Do you ever hear the birds sing in the branches bursting into bloom?

What is this life that arises anew out of the winter every year, bright with the warm sun, the prattle of the rivulet, and the swelling throat of the thrush?

Is there not joy in it and happiness? Does it not mean that we too may be joyful and happy?

And if these things are in the world, is there not a Power that brought them here? And have we men not done some foolish thing that so few are ever able to enjoy them?

Animals fare better than we; for every Maytime draws the lizard from its lair to bask in the sun.

And while we toil, begrimed with the smoke of the factory, the fields are alive with millions of living things; the air is full of the chirp of the cricket and the merry song of countless birds; the bull lows after the heifer; the lambs gambol in the pasture.

Whose is the fault?

Who made the factory but man?

Ponder over these things, oh, my brothers.

For there is a remedy; there is a way out; in so far as man is greater than the animals, in so far he can make for himself a happiness greater than theirs. But man has sought happiness for himself in the wrong way; and we who toil in weariness and smoke are paying the penalty; and the rich have no more attained happiness than we.

What, then, must men do?

They must learn the right way: the way of Wisdom.

This is the New Gospel: learn to be wise.

We cannot be wise without learning.

We must be content to learn.

Nor can we learn in a day.

We must know enough to understand why man, in seeking happiness in his own way, has compassed only his own unhappiness.

The laws of the world are not difficult.

But we must set ourselves to learn them with diligence and humility.

We have been given intelligence that we might know these laws, diminish pain through knowledge of them, and increase happiness in compliance with them.

You have heard beautiful music; no man can make beautiful music without learning.

You have seen beautiful statues; no man can make beautiful statues without learning.

And yet this most precious thing of all—happiness—think you to attain happiness without learning?

We have raised wages by organising Trade Unions; and we have done wisely.

But there is now another thing to be done; *for there is a point beyond which wages cannot rise.*

Do we all understand this?

Probably not.

To understand this altogether, we must know the law of supply and demand; the law of rent, interest and profit; the law that determines foreign exchange. These laws are not difficult, but they must be studied

and learned. When we know them, we shall understand why Trade Unions, that have proved efficient and indispensable in the past, and must be preserved for many a long year to come, must add unto themselves a new organisation upon a new plan.

This is a part of the New Dispensation.

We live in a beautiful world, and there has been furnished to us a beautiful fruit-bearing earth; all that we need to make life happy for us is here. But evil is here also; and evil sets every man upon satisfying his needs and securing his happiness in the wrong way.

There are two ways of seeking happiness; one without regard for the happiness of others, another through the happiness of others.

The first is the way of Ignorance and failure.

The second is the way of Wisdom and deliverance.

Our greatest enemy is Ignorance;

Wisdom our greatest friend.

Read then, study and digest the Book of Knowledge;

For so only can you learn the road to Happiness.



## CHAPTER II

### KNOWLEDGE

MAN differs from beasts in curiosity and intelligence.

Most beasts have curiosity only as regards the immediate satisfaction of their propensities.

A dog who comes upon a watch sniffs at it, and upon discovering that it is not good to eat loses interest in it; but an ape will put the watch to his ear.

Apes that resemble man most in the body resemble him also in curiosity; but the curiosity of the ape is trivial; and the ape lacks concentration; apish curiosity therefore avails little.

Man adds to curiosity the power of concentration; and although he dissipates his energies in satisfying curiosity regarding trivial things, he is capable also of acquiring knowledge regarding matters that do not immediately concern the satisfaction of his propensities. Through curiosity and concentration applied to useful things, man acquires knowledge.

The knowledge possessed by the entire human race is large compared to the knowledge of any one man.

But it is small compared to the complete knowledge that makes Wisdom.

Man must begin by acknowledging that there are many things of which he can never have knowledge.

He may learn the laws of heat and electricity, and how to use them to his profit; but as yet he has failed to explain what heat is or what is electricity.

He may learn the laws of motion or force, but who will tell us what motion is or force?

He may learn the laws of his own life, but who has ever explained the mystery of life itself?

He may discuss, and perhaps learn, the difference between good and evil, but shall we ever know why the Power that makes for good tolerates in the world the existence of evil?

Before this problem we may do one of two things:

We may say: "The Power is not great or good, and all is vanity," or

We may say: "The Power is great and good, for we see greatness and goodness revealed in all the things that make the world happy and joyful; but why evil is tolerated we do not know. It is a mystery."

Wherever we seek the ultimate causes of things, we come to the same dark conclusion: We do not know.

There is a vast region of the Unknown, as to which we have to admit that we are helpless.

If indeed we are helpless as regards these things, is it not foolish to be arrogant regarding them? Is it not foolish to stand up and say: "It is true I do not know why evil exists in the world; nevertheless, I claim to know that the Power that tolerates evil is neither good nor great."

Though it is difficult to discuss things of which we

know nothing, there is reason for believing that the Power is great and good.

When we begin to learn the laws of Nature we are struck by the presence of evil, and inclined to doubt the goodness of the Power that tolerates it.

But as we learn the laws of Nature more, we discover that most of the evil that makes man unhappy is of his own making; that if he will diligently study the laws of the world, and acquire the strength to obey them, he can eliminate most of the misery in the world, and thereby attain justice, and the happiness that comes from justice.

And when man has become persuaded of this he no longer can regard the Power that has made this possible as neither good nor great. Rather he learns to regard the Power as the prodigal son regarded the father whose home he forsook in his foolishness, and to which he returned when chastened and enlightened by pain.

Nay, more; if man has been given the power in great part to determine his own happiness, does not man, to the extent of that part, share in the Godhead? Is not man to that extent Divine?

Oh, my brothers, this is a mystery. Let us not speak of it with overboldness, but rather with voices hushed by reverence and wonder.

For if indeed there be in every one of us an embryo God, is not every man, every woman, every child to that extent sacred?

And if we looked upon every man and woman and child in the world with the reverence that hushes

our voice as we approach the altar, would there not be less hatred in the world, less malice and less uncharitableness?

Let us believe, then, till the contrary has been proved, that there is a Power that is great and good, and that we ourselves are a part of this power.

The more we learn, the more we shall be persuaded of this.

For the New Gospel is a completer knowledge of this Power—the Gospel of Wisdom.

And do not think that the New Gospel promises no more than the gospel of love preached nineteen hundred years ago.

At that time men had but little knowledge of the laws of Nature; this knowledge has been acquired since; and this knowledge has made possible the New Message and the New Dispensation.

No one man can know all that is known by the human race.

There are not enough waking hours in a man's life for him to acquire all human knowledge.

Every man, therefore, must content himself with the knowledge which he can acquire in his lifetime.

And he must therefore choose out of human knowledge that part which it is most essential to his happiness and purpose in life for him to know.

Thus a doctor studies the laws of health; a builder studies the laws of building; a manufacturer studies the laws of the thing he manufactures.



But we all of us are citizens; and as citizens, it is our right and duty to manage the affairs of the commonwealth.

We cannot manage the affairs of our commonwealth without acquiring a knowledge of statesmanship, for statesmanship is the art of governing a commonwealth.

It is one of the objects of this book to state the principles which underlie, and the laws that govern, statesmanship.

We cannot intelligently perform our duties as citizens without this knowledge.

It is because workers have not this knowledge that we are the servants of those who have it.

Let those who want to be free acquire this knowledge; for without it we can no more compass our own freedom than a man could without science build a steam engine.

Statesmanship is the art of managing the affairs of citizens grouped in the State.

In order to understand and manage the interests of the State, it is indispensable to understand the interests of the men who constitute the State.

The first thing a statesman therefore has to study is Man.

## CHAPTER III

### MAN

MAN occupies a peculiar position in Nature.

Other animals are, as it were, the result of the conditions which surround them—that is to say, of the environment.

Thus animals that live entirely in the water have no legs, but only fins.

Animals that live in the air have wings.

Animals that live in the tropics have thick, hairless skins to keep them cool in spite of the heat of the sun.

Animals that live in the arctics have thick, hairy skins to keep them warm in spite of low temperament.

The same animal—as for example, the elephant—has different kinds of skin according as it lives in the tropics or near the North Pole.

The camel, that lives in the waterless desert, acquires a special stomach to hold water ; it acquires elastic pads under its feet to protect them from the burning sand.

It seems, therefore, that animals change with the environment.

They acquire the qualities necessary to survive in the environment in which they live.

If they did not acquire them they would perish.

And as a matter of fact, millions unfit perish and only a few fit survive.

Among the grass-eating animals which constitute the natural prey of the meat-eating animals, it is the swiftest that escape.

Thus horses acquire speed.

And among the meat-eating animals, it is those whose scent is keenest or whose speed is greatest that overtake their quarry.

Thus foxhounds which are not fleet have keen scent ; while staghounds which have not keen scent are fleet.

We find therefore, among animals prior to the advent of man in the world, certain laws at work, as regards which animals themselves are helpless. The animals at the North Pole are different from those at the Equator. They have been made different by the difference in their environment. We can say therefore that animals are moulded by their environment.

We shall study later the laws which determine the moulding of animals by the environment ; these laws are the laws of animal development or evolution.

Man differs from animals as regards his relation to the environment.

Animals are helpless in this respect ; they must change with every change of environment or perish.

Man is not helpless in this respect. On the contrary, instead of changing himself with every change of environment, he protects himself by intelligent effort from the fatal effects of such changes.

In the tropics he builds houses to keep himself cool; in cold climates he builds houses to keep himself warm.

He neither destroys the bull nor flees from tigers; but makes weapons with which to slay the tiger, and reduces the bull to a benevolent servitude.

He has changed the face of Nature to suit his convenience.

He destroys the animals that are hurtful to him, and carefully trains and domesticates those of which he can make use.

He uses the torrent to turn his mill, and the lightning to light his dwelling.

The gale is bridled to swell his sail, and the flame trained to move his factory.

Wherever he goes, he creates a climate to suit himself; he creates his own environment.

So that the environment no longer moulds man.

Man moulds his environment.

This Power to mould the environment is the greatest of all the Powers.

It is the nascent Godhead of man.

Before the coming of man, the environment was sovereign; when it was favourable, life developed in it to higher and higher forms; when it was unfavourable, life degenerated to lower and lower forms. And to-day still, in a good environment, flourish bud, blossom and fruit abundantly, and every living creature that moves multiplying each after its kind; but at the Poles survives only grey

lichen on the cold stones, and in the parched desert survive only sage brush and aloes.

Man appears, and all changes.

He carries his own climate to the Poles : where gold is, there man lives and prospers ; the barren shores of Alaska swarm with miners, and glow with borrowed flame.

He carries his own climate to the desert ; he brings water to it, and there is fulfilled the word of the prophet Isaiah : "The desert shall blossom as the rose."

A part of this Power has been given to Man, and Man is as yet hardly conscious of this Power ; he has used it little and abused it much.

Learn, then, oh, my brothers, what this Power is that has been given to you ; learn how little it has profited, how much it has harmed you ; learn the way of Wisdom, for it is the only way, and by it will come to you blessing and happiness and freedom, for in the Holy Scripture it has been truly said : "Ye are gods."

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ART OF LIFE

MAN is born into a world of good and evil ; and unlike the beasts of the field, he has been given the Power to choose the good and destroy the evil.

But until he can distinguish between good and evil, he can neither profit by the one nor escape the other.

The Bible deals only with moral good and moral evil. But physical good and physical evil do as much to make human happiness and human unhappiness as moral. They do indeed perhaps more, because it is more difficult for a man who is hungry and cold to be moral than for one who is warm and comfortable. The New Dispensation therefore deals with physical good and evil as well as moral.

Wisdom is the Knowledge of good and evil, and the Power to do good and eschew evil.

No man who has this Knowledge and this Power can do evil or endure it ; for evil is unhappiness.

It is because man has not this knowledge and power that he continues to do evil.

Learn, then, the difference between good and evil, for it is this knowledge alone that can set you free.

Man can mould the environment, not only as regards climate and material things, but also as regards morality and things spiritual.

The beasts of the field act only according to their instinct or habit ; they cannot resist instinct or overcome it.

Man can act against his instinct according to a Higher Law ; he can resist his instinct and overcome it.

You have heard this Higher Law called Religion.

But it is also Wisdom, for it involves the knowledge of good and evil.

The nearer man attains to Wisdom, the more he resists instinct and governs conduct according to the Higher Law.

And a wise man does this not to appease a jealous God, not to escape the punishment of God ; he does this for one end only : to be happy.

Man has a right to be happy ; the Power that makes for good makes also for happiness, for good is happiness.

Nor shall man be happy only in an after life of which he knows nothing, or in another world of which he knows nothing.

He shall be happy in this world, the laws of which he can learn if he will, and the laws of which, once learned and obeyed, will bring him happiness.

Learn, then, the laws of this world ; learn the powers which have been given us. But beware also and learn the powers against which we strive

in vain. For there is evil in the world as to which no remedy has, as yet, been revealed. There is Death and there is Suffering.

But of the suffering that there is in the world the larger part is of the making of man ; the larger part comes of Ignorance.

Let us at least banish this larger part.

To do this is the Art of Life.



## CHAPTER V

### THE ART OF HAPPINESS

IN life there are many Arts.

There is the art of manufacturing iron, porcelain, cloth, for use ; there is the Art of Music, there are the Drama, Sculpture, Painting, for pleasure.

The greatest art of all is the Art of Happiness ; it is the most important, for Happiness is the object of all the other arts ; and it is the most difficult because it requires some knowledge of all the other arts, and for this last reason perhaps it has been the most neglected.

It is impossible for any one man to know all the arts together ; nor is it necessary.

There is an art of happiness that assumes a knowledge by others of the other arts ; a knowledge by the doctor of the art of medicine ; by the builder of the art of building ; by the farmer of the art of farming. The Art of Happiness undertakes to learn how every man, each exercising his art, can attain happiness.

One of the objects of this book is to study the Art of Happiness.

The Art of Happiness includes many principles

that are well known ; so well known that to repeat them is tedious.

It includes also a few—a very few—principles that are either unknown or deliberately ignored.

For example, it is well known that happiness consists not of satiety but of satisfaction. And yet millionaires continue to gorge themselves to satiety and thereby deprive themselves of satisfaction. The cow-boy who brings a good appetite to a crust of bread enjoys his meal. The millionaire who brings a sated appetite to a banquet cannot enjoy it. Nevertheless, the millionaire continues to defeat his appetite by gorging it, and the cow-boy continues to envy the discontented millionaire.

Neither have learned the Art of Happiness.

And yet, over two thousand years ago, Aristotle taught that Virtue is but another name for moderation.

Clearly, something more is needed than mere exhortation to enforce the lesson of moderation.

What is this something more ?

Man cannot practise moderation if he is prevented from doing so by want or too much tempted by wealth. In other words, the Environment must permit moderation, and man must be capable of it.

To understand this, we must study further the nature of man and the nature of the world outside of man ; for these two react upon each other.

Man cannot be happy at the North Pole or in the unwatered desert. When the conditions outside of man are sufficiently hostile, man cannot be happy in them.

But man continues to be unhappy even when the

conditions outside of him seem most favourable to happiness.

Clearly, then, there are two great factors of happiness: the conditions that are outside of man, and the conditions that are within him.

The first of these factors is called Environment. The second of them is Man himself.

Let us study these two, one after another, in the Book of Facts. For here ends the Book of Exhortation.



Book II  
THE BOOK OF FACTS



## CHAPTER I

### ENVIRONMENT

THERE are two kinds of Environment: the environment of Nature, and the environment made by man.

We shall study first the environment of Nature, and begin by distinguishing therein two systems: first, the competitive system, or so-called struggle for life; and second, the co-operative or community system; confining ourselves in both cases to facts observed in Nature prior to or outside of the intervention of man.

#### A. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

##### (a) *The Struggle for Life, or the Competitive System*

It has been already said that the beasts of the field are the necessary products of the environment.

The study of the crust of the earth reveals that upon the central mass which has cooled from a molten state there have been laid layer upon layer of sand, clay and limestone by successive seas, which have successively rested on buried continents. And nearly every layer contains fragments of shell, scale or bone belonging to the beasts that have

succeeded to one another upon the earth during millions and millions of years.

These layers of sand, clay and limestone are the leaves of a gigantic book, the earliest of which are burned by fire, the next scarred by it, and the most recent illustrated by pictures so vivid that we can read the story there of the development of man from the lowest of all forms of life.

The rocks are charts painted by the hand of God Himself.

And in these charts we read the story of Evolution. We learn the geography of the world millions of years before the age of history; we know that this land upon which we live has not only once, but often been sunk beneath a deep sea; that during the earliest period there was no living thing more highly organised than a crab; not a fish nor any animal possessing the backbone that distinguishes the Vertebrates to which man belongs from the Invertebrates to which belong the lowest kinds of living thing. We know that after the whole face of the world was changed came a warm period called Carboniferous, and that just before and during this Carboniferous period there slowly developed fish possessing the backbone that marks one of the great strides in animal development. But at this time we see no trace of the four-footed mammalia which immediately precede man.

In the marshes in which forests grew and died during the Carboniferous period, there were piled, one upon another, layers of vegetation that hardened into coal; this coal sank slowly beneath a deepening



sea. And in this so-called cretaceous sea were deposited, in its deepest parts, huge masses of chalk, accumulated from countless shells. But upon its shores crept four-footed things resembling fish, as the seal and the sea-lion resemble them to-day, closely allied to them and clearly developed from them, as if fish stranded upon the shallows had used their fins for motion upon the banks, and out of fins made legs. And from the gigantic lizards of the cretaceous period we find in the over-lying tertiary beds the infinite variety of four-legged animals which people our continents to-day.

All this knowledge, full of profound interest to the student of man, comes from a study of the Earth called Geology.

And next comes a study of living things called Zoology, to tell us how this amazing development of life from lower to higher forms proceeded. For centuries man studied the living things on the earth, and added fact to fact till at last, a few years ago, Darwin, Wallace and others demonstrated the law according to which this development takes place. This law is called the law of Evolution.

Briefly it is this:

All living things prior to the advent of man tended to adapt themselves to the Environment by the process known as the survival of the fit. That is to say, only those animals fit to survive survived; all the rest perished. And when there was a change of environment, as, for example, of climate, only those individuals survived that were capable of adapting themselves to this change.

The process by which animals adapt themselves to changes of environment is as follows :

There is in every new generation of animals an infinite variety ; some differ enough from the rest to be called "sports." These differences are transmitted to future generations by heredity. Men have used these differences to create types of animals suited to their purpose. So by putting stallions built for speed to mares similarly built, man has produced the race-horse. On the contrary, by putting stallions built for drawing loads to mares similarly built, man has produced the cart-horse.

Before the advent of man this selection of types was made by the Environment or by Nature, as the Environment used to be called. Hence the expression, Natural Selection, is used to describe the process by which Nature or Environment selects certain types for survival at the expense of the rest ; the process by which animals that live in the desert gradually adapt themselves to endure great heat ; and by which those that live near the Poles gradually adapt themselves to endure great cold.

And the Environment or Nature uses in this process of selection a very cruel but effectual device : A great many more living things are born into the world than the world can support. In the lower forms of life Nature is wastefully fertile ; thousands of herrings' eggs are laid for one herring that grows to maturity. This amazing fertility of Nature results in a struggle for life which condemns the enormous majority of living things born into the world to an early death, but has the singular advantage of allowing

only the types most fitted to the environment to survive ; and this process of natural selection acting in an environment favourable to development from a lower to a higher type has gradually caused the lowest forms of life which consist of a mere sack of so-called protoplasm to develop organs especially adapted to accomplish specific things: a mouth to take in food ; a stomach to digest it ; bowels to assimilate it ; a system of circulation ; arms and legs ; a nervous system ; a brain ; ears ; a nose ; eyes ; until at last, in the order of creation as demonstrated in the great Book of the Rocks, and as confirmed by Zoology and other sciences, Man has evolved out of the original protoplasmic sack.

Who created the first protoplasmic sack ; why this cruel system was invented by which life was ordered to pass through millions of sacrificed and suffering bodies before it could emerge into the least imperfect form ; why man to-day must suffer still in the progress which he is destined to make from his present to a still higher form—these are things which it is not given us yet to answer. But that this process has taken place during a period of time so long, and at a cost of agony so cruel that the heart grows faint at the attempt to imagine it, is a fact which no man who has studied the face of Nature can deny.

If we want to learn the art of happiness—for in spite of the process just described there is nevertheless an art of happiness—we must understand the processes of Nature. It is only by understanding the

processes of Nature that we can ever hope to modify them.

And it is here that we come to the first great lesson we have to learn from a study of Evolution :

Man has already modified the processes of Nature in the past, and he can doubtless still further modify them in the time to come. Here is our hope, and here is our salvation.

But before we undertake to study how far man has modified, and may still modify, the cruel process of natural selection, there is another process observable in Nature to which we must direct our most earnest attention.

It is a common error to suppose that because man has developed from a lower form of life through a process of struggle for survival that favours a few types at the expense of millions of other forms condemned by this struggle to suffering and death, therefore it is only by this same struggle that man can hope to attain a higher form of development. This is the error that approves the competitive system and the resulting classification of men into a few rich and many poor. And it is because the question as to the merits and demerits of the competitive system rests upon the principles of evolution that it is indispensable for every worker who wants to understand the competitive system of which he is the victim, also to understand the principles of Evolution, upon which this competitive system rests.

For the workers who deny the force of competition altogether are as wrong as the millionaires who base

their argument in favour of the competitive system upon the law of Evolution.

We cannot afford to neglect the argument drawn from the struggle of life involved in natural selection. Until we have shown that there is something better than this struggle that can be put in its place, we have left to the millionaires the vantage-ground, from which they can quiet the conscience of the world. Thousands of our fellow-creatures who are lifted above us by the accident of wealth would come over to our side were they not sincerely convinced that poverty, pauperism and crime are necessary evils; that they belong to the cosmic principles of evolution through which man has attained his existing dominion, and through which he may hope, though not without infinite patience and agony, ultimately to reach a still higher station.

This error must be removed, and it can only be removed by sober argument. Temper will not do it; nor indignation; nor vituperation; nor hate. There is a collection of plain facts which, if properly marshalled, are sufficient to prove the error of the notion that competition is a necessary evil, and that society cannot exist without competition, and the poverty, pauperism and crime that result therefrom.

Let us now proceed to marshal these facts convincingly and in order, remembering that man is not a sack, and can be neither emptied nor filled in a single effort. The demonstration will not result therefore from a mere study of environment, but from a combination of the following studies:

I. A completion of the study of Environment.

II. A brief but compendious study of man in his relation to Environment.

This study of man will include :

- (a) The difference between Natural and Human Environment.
- (b) What man has wisely done in creating his own Environment.
- (c) What man has unwisely done in creating his own Environment.
- (d) What man has still to do in creating a new Environment.

We are now in a position to proceed to the next step ; that is, to complete our study of Environment by that of the co-operative system that exists in Nature as well as the competitive.

#### A. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

##### (b) *The Co-operative System*

We have already seen that the struggle for life has had for effect to permit only those forms of life to survive that adapted themselves to the environment, and that when the environment was favourable to development, this tendency of the fit to survive at the expense of the less fit caused an evolution from lower to higher forms of life. The effect of this tendency in the higher forms of life has been to create two very opposite types—the carnivores, who became more and more skilful in tracking game, and more and more powerful in destroying it ; and the

herbivores, the natural prey of the carnivores, who became more and more swift in escaping their pursuers. Now the herbivores, conscious of their weakness, early developed the instinct to herd for the purpose of common defence. The fierce carnivore, on the contrary, is prevented by his natural ferocity from herding. He therefore tends to become solitary. Lions and tigers are solitary animals; whereas sheep, goats, horses and cattle herd. This tendency to herd tends to develop in proportion as an animal is weak; so that it is in insects that we find the herding instinct most perfectly developed, and certain colonies of ants and bees present a picture of co-operation to which the attention of millionaires cannot be too strenuously directed.

Let it be said at the outset that these colonies are not offered as models for us to imitate. On the contrary, there are many features in these colonies which humanity will probably be right in diligently avoiding. But just as there are certain features in the competitive system that are good and some that are atrociously bad, so there are features in the colony system that are bad and some that are altogether good. It will later on appear that the essential privilege of man is to be able to choose the good of both and eschew the bad.

A honeycomb is a city of bees built by the entire community for its common use. This community consists for the most part of barren females who do all the hard work, and are therefore commonly called the workers; they build the comb, and add to it as the community enlarges; they attend on the



queen bee—the only fertile female allowed to survive ; they feed her, and act the part of midwife to her when she lays her eggs ; they see to the hatching of the eggs, and by crowding about them provide them with the necessary temperature ; when the eggs are hatched, the workers feed the young ones differently so as to produce a few fertile females to play the rôle of queen should the throne become vacant, a larger number of males to be utilised when the hour of nuptial arrives, and a larger number still of barren females to continue the work of the community ; the workers collect honey from the flowers in the summer and store it away for common use during the cold season ; they determine which of the fertile females is to be impregnated and become their queen ; she is liberated on her wedding-day, and in a summer flight, pursued by the males, conceives. When she returns to the comb she is let loose upon the other fertile females in the comb, and watched as she stings her possible rivals to death one by one. Few of the males return from the nuptial flight ; one only of them weds, and he perishes in the act ; the others perish without wedding, or if they have strength to return to the comb, are despatched by the workers watching at the entrance to perform the execution.

It is impossible to conceive a more complete system of co-operation or communism than this, or one which so little conforms to our notions of justice or welfare. Indeed, it is probable that from a human point of view the tiger in the jungle attains a greater measure of what we call happiness than any member of a bee



community ; for the workers seem to labour without reward ; of the males only one weds, and he perishes in the act ; and the queen herself is kept a close prisoner during her entire existence, save only during the brief ecstasy of the nuptial flight.

The lesson to be learned from insect communities seems then to be, not that co-operation in a natural environment results in the maximum of happiness, but merely that co-operation is as much a part of Nature's plan as competition, and that therefore the co-operative system is as available to man as the competitive. The problem before man is how to take the best out of both systems, and eliminate the bad.

But there is a further lesson to be drawn from the singular customs that prevail in the hive and in the ants' nest :

In both, the entire energies of all seem concentrated upon two problems—the support of the community, and its perpetuation ; and as these two problems are identically the same as those by which men are confronted, the systems adopted to solve them cannot but be of absorbing interest to man.

Nature or Environment follows two diverging lines in animal development. Along one line she seeks the perfection of the *individual* ; along the other line she seeks the perfection of the *community*. But mark, the ideal of perfection presented by Nature is not Justice or Morality : it is *perpetuation* ; for perpetuation is the prize offered to the most fit types in the struggle for survival. And there are obviously two ways in which types can succeed in this struggle : one by individual excellence, and another

by compensating for individual deficiency through collective excellence. Thus there was slowly developed along carnivorous lines two types now familiar to us in the domestic cat and dog.

The dog type developed several qualities, each of which produced a special breed.

It developed craft, which, because it had for the condition of its progress the development of the brain, did not require much physical development. So the fox, fitted through craft to escape its enemies and catch its prey, remains small and solitary.

It developed scent, which, associated with persistence and an instinct to herd upon occasion requiring it, produced the hound and wolf, both small.

The cat type, on the other hand, developed rather upon lines of physical excellence. Nature clothed its powerful frame with sinews of steel; its claws with velvet; armed its jaws with inevitable fangs, and striped its soft coat so that in the shadow of the bamboo, where it lies in wait, it may be indistinguishable to its prey.

The tiger is the most perfect assassin yet devised by a beneficent Environment; and, possessing the moral as well as the physical qualities which fit it for the rôle, it is fierce in all its appetites. Now appetites are twofold: sexual appetite and appetite for food. These condemn the tiger to a solitary existence, owing to the ferocity with which it fights for both.

When now we turn to the living things which are driven by individual weakness to collective existence, we observe that while this collective existence helps them to solve the problem of food, it accentuates that

presented by sexual jealousy. And this sexual jealousy must be eliminated from a community if its members are to live in permanent harmony together. The scheme adopted by Nature in the beehive to eliminate sexual jealousy is radical and cruel, but effectual. It allows only one female to be fertile, and destroys the male sex on attaining maturity altogether.

Obviously, the community system proceeds with reckless disregard of the individual; the destruction of all the fertile females save the single queen and of all the male sex without exception; the singular fact that the sting cannot be used save at the cost of the life of the individual using it; the enforced chastity of all the workers—all prove that Nature's plan for securing the welfare of the community is to sacrifice thereto the happiness and the lives of the individuals that constitute it.

Obviously, man must find some better solution of this problem than ants and bees. How man has at various periods attempted to solve it we shall study later. But before leaving Natural Environment, we have still a lesson to learn from the moral qualities which the two lines of divergence have respectively developed; the qualities of the solitary carnivora and those of the communistic bee.

And we may be helped in this effort by observing the habits of herding animals that are neither so fierce as the lion nor so servile as the ant. For although it has of late been the fashion to justify our existing capitalistic system by exaggerating the extent to which competition exists in Nature, a careful study of Nature will reveal that though competition does prevail

between different species, it is the exception rather than the rule between individuals of the same species. In other words, Nature has proceeded along two lines of development: one along the line of mutual struggle, and another along that of mutual aid. Thus we find even carnivora, such as the hyena and the wolf, herding for the purpose of the chase; even foxes and bears have been seen to herd; eagles, kites and pelicans notoriously associate to this end. Practically all herbivora herd more or less permanently, the permanence of the herd depending apparently upon the mildness or the ferocity of the sexual instinct. Thus in the case of the elk, the stag, the bull and the horse, that fight for the female, and thus prevent the weak from perpetuating the race, the herd breaks up into groups during the rutting season; whereas, in the case of apes and monkeys, the herd remains permanent, and it is perhaps for this reason that apes and monkeys betray evidence of race degeneration.

Too little is known about the sexual relations of such animals as herd permanently for any certain conclusions to be drawn from them, but it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that Nature has succeeded best through the combination of strength, selfishness and ferocity on the one hand, and that of intelligence, altruism<sup>1</sup> and servility on the other;

<sup>1</sup> The word "altruism" is used instead of the more familiar word unselfishness to avoid the criticism of those who contend that there is no such thing as unselfishness. It is true that we are all selfish in the sense that we are all seeking happiness for ourselves; but selfishness can be defined as the search for happiness regardless of the happiness of others, and altruism as the search for happiness through the happiness of others.

for it is the lion and the tiger that dominate the jungles of Asia; in Africa and South America it is the white ant.

These considerations lead us to conclusions of great importance, for they enable us to trace the development of certain habits or instincts, which, when we find them developed in man, become lifted into virtues or vices according to their nature and intensity. Thus solitude imposes upon solitary animals habits of selfishness and self-reliance; the tiger has no one to look to but himself for the satisfaction of the two great animal needs—for food and self-perpetuation; he is the Ishmaelite of the animal kingdom; his hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him. Whereas, community life, on the other hand, imposes upon the ant habits of docility and altruism; he works not for himself but for his neighbours; he is a natural slave, but a slave to a useful end—the common weal of all.

To sum up: Nature or Environment, or, to be accurate, Natural Environment, has operated on animal life through the principle of Evolution or Survival of the Fittest in such a manner as to develop physical organs and instinctive habits, both of which seem to be necessary results. These physical organs and instinctive habits depend for their nature and excellence upon two parallel systems:

According to one, the struggle for life has taken place not only between one species and another, but

also between individuals of the same species; this has resulted in *individual* excellence, as in the case of the lion and the tiger; and has developed habits of selfishness, self-reliance and ferocity. According to the other, the struggle for life has taken place mainly between one species and another, and hardly at all between individuals of the same species, but both the lives and the happiness of the individual are recklessly sacrificed to it; this has resulted in *collective* excellence at the expense of the individual; and has developed habits of docility and altruism.

In the former, or competitive system, there is the greatest individual freedom of action and the greatest individual satisfaction of animal propensities, but there is the greatest individual risk, few survive at the expense of the many, and there is little or no social satisfaction whatever.

In the latter, or co-operative system, there is less individual freedom, less satisfaction of animal propensities (indeed, sexual appetite is left unsatisfied for all except one individual of each sex, and at the expense of personal liberty for the female and for the male of life itself), but there is least individual risk for the workers, and most social satisfaction.

Intermediate systems partake of both the competitive and co-operative plan, none of the intermediate systems, however, leading to supremacy, and some of them resulting in degeneracy.

Such are the necessary results of the unconscious action of Natural Environment on living things.

We are now in a position to study the actual and possible results of the conscious action of an artificial environment on Man.

## B. HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Before studying the possible effects upon man of an Artificial Environment, consciously and deliberately created by him with the definite purpose of attaining the maximum of human perfection and happiness, we must be clear as to the actual effects upon man of the Artificial Environment in which he actually finds himself. And first and foremost, we must give its full value to the fact that the Environment in which we live is in great part Artificial and not Natural, or in other words, it is the product not of Nature only but also of Art.

We have seen that the lower animals, prior to the advent of man, were the necessary product of the Natural Environment. We have now to study just how man has modified the face of the world, both as regards them and as regards himself, by the application thereto of Art.

The most obvious and striking change effected by Art on human life is in relation to climate.

There is geologic evidence that the forefathers of man in what is called the Miocene Period, while not so intellectual as man, were of a far higher type than any living ape; the head, for example, indicated a superior structure. Now, the Miocene Period was exceptionally warm. The bones of the so-called Troglodytes are found in the caves of the Dordogne



with other vegetable and animal remains that indicate a tropical temperature. This was followed by the so-called glacial epoch which substituted for tropical conditions those now existing in the Arctic zone. The Troglodyte had to choose between two alternatives; he either had to flee to the tropics before the cold wave from the North; or to resist the cold by recourse to Art: that is to say, by recourse to clothing. It is probable that he did both; some did the one, and the rest did the other; some fled to the tropics and degenerated there into the existing anthropoid apes; the rest invented weapons with which to slay fur-bearing animals, to strip them of their skins, and convert the skins into clothing; used the shelter furnished by natural caves, and eventually discovered the way to produce a flame. This last Promethean gift was probably the first of the great human inventions. When man discovered how to produce and utilise fire he became superior to climate.

And this discovery produced an amazing consequence: for it seems certain that our race made its first strides towards civilisation in tropical countries; but that progress in the Arts, by enabling man to inhabit colder and more bracing climates, permitted of his increasing his power to resist not only climate but all the other natural conditions that were hostile to his improvement; and so we find the Northern races gradually subduing those of the South, and demonstrating the Great Rule that man's progress is secured, not by yielding to Natural Environment, as in the case of the lower animals, but by resisting it.



Now the key to human progress in the past, and the probable key to human progress in the future, is to be found in the faculty of man to resist Nature ; and this faculty is twofold. Intelligence is the more obvious of the two. But intelligence is not sufficient of itself. Intelligence must be coupled with the Power of Self-Restraint. For although intelligence is the light which can guide men toward perfection, it is useless unless accompanied by the willingness and power to follow the light.

What avails it to the millionaire to know that he can, by the intelligent use of his millions, alleviate the misery of the poor, if he lacks the willingness and power to apply this knowledge ?

What avails it to us to know that by substituting co-operation for competition in the production of the necessities of life, poverty can be annihilated, if we have not the power to effect the substitution ?

What avails it to a drunkard to know that drink is the cause of his misery, if he has not the power to refuse it ?

In man's struggle with climate, intelligence seems to play the principal *rôle*, but there is also by the side of it a spirit of resistance, in strong contrast with the spirit of submission that characterises the lower animals. And in other arenas the power of self-control plays a still more conspicuous part. For example, there is probably no institution in which man differs more from the lower animals than in that of marriage ; and none more characterised by self-control. If we compare the promiscuous intercourse

that prevails between the sexes in troops of apes with the fidelity that characterises the highest types of marriage in our most highly civilised communities, we cannot but be struck, not only with the enormous gap between the two, but also with the dominant *rôle* played in development from the lower to the higher type by the power of self-control. For example, the passionate propensity that condemns the fiercer carnivora to solitude, and reduces even the docile bee to a wholesale massacre of one of the two sexes, has been so controlled in our civilisation that we find men and women not only living in the closest proximity without violating the marriage vow, but even consecrating themselves to lifelong chastity out of respect for a religious scruple.

Man has attained this result through the training of children by parents in the family, of youth by masters in schools, and of adults each by himself in the world at large.

Perhaps the most precious result of the institution of marriage is the education furnished by the family, which results from marriage. In Greek life this education was the kernal of Greek Religion. Every family worshipped its own gods, and these gods were the shades of its ancestors. Almost every duty in life resolved itself into a duty to these shades; the duty to marry was but to ensure offspring who would continue to minister to the deceased; the duty of chastity, and indeed of morality in general, resolved itself into a duty to keep inviolable the sacred flame upon the hearth.

The two virtues peculiarly stimulated by Greek religion were courage in man and chastity in woman; these singularly correspond to the qualities that characterise solitary carnivora—ferocity in the male and compulsory fidelity in the female. They are the virtues that attend individualism, and individualism so impregnated Greek civilisation that it prevented the Greek cities from ever combining into a Greek nation, and ultimately left them a prey to the invader. And these two individualistic virtues—courage and chastity—became still more emphasised under the Roman rule in the soldier and the vestal.

Christianity introduced a new element into civilised life; Christ deprecated exhibitions of courage by inculcating humility; He even tempered the fierce demand for fidelity by bidding “him who was without sin cast the first stone at her.” The virtue He taught above all was the virtue of Love; not love in the sense of natural affection, but love in the sense of sacrifice; not love confined to the family, but love extended from the family to the neighbour: “Love your neighbour as yourself.” And so under the dispensation of Christ all men being the children of a common Father, became as brothers one to another; the early Christians carrying out this theory into practical life, abandoned the acquisition of private wealth and brought all their earnings into a common stock, giving to every one according to his need.

Unfortunately, the prosperity of the Church under Constantine converted it into a political machine as

unconscionable in its methods, and as effectual in its results, as the so-called rings which govern many cities to-day. The Church forgot the virtues which it was instituted to teach; and our Western civilisation has ever since been distracting us by encouraging the fighting virtues of the Roman soldier on the one hand, and the altogether inconsistent humility of the Christian saint on the other.

But men and women cannot live close to one another for centuries, as we have done, without having social virtues forced upon them; and while the competitive system which prevails in our industrial and international relations has stimulated the fighting qualities in us, the teaching of Christ has preserved in our hearts ideals of happiness which have more or less unconsciously created a tendency to replace competition by co-operation wherever possible.

And the joint effect of both Roman and Christian rules of conduct has been to substitute for the qualities that we observe in Nature — the lust and ferocity of the carnivore and the servility of the ant—new qualities altogether different, and in some respects almost opposite. For lust has been replaced by a conception of the conjugal relation which converts marriage into a sacrament; ferocity has yielded to the courage of the mediæval knight and the modern gentleman; servility tends more and more to disappear and be replaced by respect for law; and fear has been lifted by Religion into reverence—"The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom."

The fact that these virtues are held up to us as desirable, and that we are trained to conform thereto, is of dominating importance in considering the character of Human Environment ; and were there nothing in human institutions to render the universal practice of these virtues impossible, we would assuredly enjoy the happiness that must result therefrom.

Unfortunately there are two reasons why we cannot practise these virtues though we would :

In the first place, we are divided up into nations, each of which is striving with all the rest to secure for its citizens the largest possible share of the good things of this world.

In the second place, every nation is composed of individuals or families, each of which is engaged in a similar strife.

The first of these, which we may call the international conflict, gives rise to a peculiar virtue called patriotism, which, in so far as it teaches a man to love the country to which he belongs, and the people amongst whom he lives, is altogether good, but in so far as it teaches him to hate and occasionally slay those of other nations is altogether bad.

The second of these, which we may call the intranational conflict, gives rise to a quality which, though not recognised as a virtue, should, if measured by the rewards it receives, be assuredly regarded as the greatest of all—acquisitiveness ; for the fortunate few who possess this quality gather unto themselves all the good things in the world at the expense of all the rest.

Let us briefly study each of these formidable obstacles to virtue and happiness :

As regards the international conflict, the world is so large, and is peopled by races of men so different, that it would be quite impossible to include them all under the same Government. The Red Indian is incapable of adopting our civilisation; he would rather die. The Chinese has a conception of government so different from ours that he has no word in his language for patriotism, and cannot form to himself any idea of what it is. The Oriental, who has occupied the Danubian provinces for five centuries, is still so foreign to us that he cannot live amongst Christians except either as a conqueror in Turkey or as a subject in Hindoostan.

So long as these differences exist, there must be separate nations; and so long as there are separate nations, the smoke of international conflict must occasionally burst into a flame.

Nevertheless, even to-day human effort can do much to diminish occasions for war; witness the Tribunal of the Hague and the daily multiplying treaties of arbitration; witness, too, the gradual extension of solidarity between working men beyond national frontiers and the growing disposition to organise regardless of them.

As regards the intra-national conflict—that is to say, the conflict between individuals belonging to the same country—there is much more to be said, for although the total elimination of occasions of conflict between citizens of the same nation may still be far off, may indeed be totally impossible, there is serious

reason to believe that a partial elimination of them is not only immediately possible, but may constitute the most practical of all political programmes and the most vital of all religious faiths. Indeed, a thorough understanding of the problem presented by this intra-national conflict is so indispensable to its prosperous solution, that upon this understanding may be said to depend the question whether our civilisation is peacefully to progress or whether it is to be drowned in the most awful deluge of blood the world has ever seen.

This issue probably depends more upon the enlightenment of us workers than upon any other factor of the State; for it is the workers who are to-day, by organisation in Trade Unions, best equipped to undertake the task; and it is the workers who will doubtless ultimately decide whether this task is to be attempted through revolution under the impulse of hate or through regeneration under the impulse of sympathy and co-operation.

The practical question for the worker is this: Given existing conditions, and given the instruments now in the hands of the workers, how can he best use these instruments to secure for himself the greatest liberty and happiness? The instruments at his disposal are the rifle and the vote; which of these two can be used with best effect?

We cannot come to a sound conclusion without first understanding the conditions in which we find ourselves; the study of these conditions is the main purpose of this book.



As has been already observed, the intra-national conflict is mainly concerned with the acquisition of wealth; and because this conflict has so far had for result inordinately to enrich a few and impoverish the mass, it is the fashion amongst some of us to rail against wealth.

But wealth is the necessary product of civilisation, and like manure, it is a benefaction when lightly distributed over the right place, though it is a pest when heavily concentrated in the wrong. The wealthier a community is the happier it ought to be. It is not therefore wealth itself which constitutes our grievance, but the method of its distribution.

Now the unjust distribution of wealth is mainly due to the system of private property, under which the few who have the gift of money-making acquire large fortunes, while the many are left in comparative poverty and even want. It has been said that the only method for putting an end to the existing inequality of fortune is for wealth to be accumulated by the State through the industry of all its citizens, and distributed by the State justly amongst them.

The difficulties in the way of such a system are conscientiously believed by most to be insuperable; we shall examine this question later. Suffice it now to point out that the system which actually prevails is diametrically opposite to that which, as all agree, would, if practicable, result in the greatest justice and happiness. Every man, instead of working for all, is working only for himself, and he who has most



acquisitiveness becomes master of those who have less, society being by this single quality divided into a series of classes or castes, at the top of which are a few millionaires, and at the bottom of which is the large contingent that after a life of misery end their lives in the almshouse, the prison, or the lunatic asylum—a contingent that has been determined by carefully prepared statistics to constitute one-fifth of the entire population in the richest country in the world.<sup>1</sup>

When we come to the study of economic conditions we shall see that private property, however great may be the price we pay for it, has played an essential *rôle* in the slow enfranchisement of the people; and therefore does not deserve the wholesale condemnation it generally receives at the hands of socialists. But just as the cocoon serves an essential purpose in protecting the worm during its slow development, but becomes a prison which the butterfly discards when it attains its final freedom, so private property may turn out to have already served its purpose if we can demonstrate ourselves so far developed as to be fit to cast it aside.

Let us consider, then, just what *rôle* private property plays in our human environment to-day :

In the first place, it is the great stimulus which sets each one of us to work for himself, and by working for himself to accumulate wealth that contributes to the maintenance of all the rest.

<sup>1</sup> This conclusion is arrived at by Sir Charles Booth in a statistical work which commands the approval of all authorities of whatever shade of political opinion.

In the second place, it furnishes a method under which the man who works most effectually gets the highest reward.

Now, as it is essential in every community that every man should contribute to the maintenance of all, and as justice seems to demand that the workers should be rewarded according to results, it is claimed that private property solves the problem of production in a manner that is both effectual and just.

Private property, however, by setting every man to work for himself regardless of all the rest—that is to say, upon the competitive plan—prevents men from proceeding upon the far more economical plan of co-operation; and to those who apply to the study of these questions some knowledge of evolution and the effect of environment, private property seems to play a *rôle* inevitably bad. The importance of this point requires that special attention be devoted to it.

### C. PRIVATE PROPERTY

#### *Its Effect on Type*

We have seen that under the law of evolution type tends to adapt itself to environment. It must so adapt itself or perish. There is no escape from this iron law. If the climate change from warm to cold, animals must put on blubber or fur; if the climate change from cold to hot, they must throw off blubber or fur. Those who adapt themselves to the change survive; those who do not adapt themselves die.

So also, if in a given community the individual can secure the necessities of life only on the condition of outdoing his neighbour, it is those who most successfully outdo their neighbours who will prevail ; those who are outdone will sink deeper and deeper into poverty and ultimately join the irreclaimable fifth.

The effect, then, of private property on type is to stimulate all the qualities that go to make up acquisitiveness ; selfishness first and foremost, and all the necessary results of selfishness afterwards—avarice, greed, envy, injustice, hardness of heart.

It would be by no means fair to maintain that no man can be successful in business who is not cursed with all these vices. On the contrary, some of our greatest philanthropists have been successful business men. But philanthropy generally results from the blessed principle of reaction, under which vice, when it gets bad enough, creates a revulsion toward good, as indeed, alas ! virtue, when it gets virtuous enough, creates also in some a revulsion towards evil. Reaction, however, is the eddy in the stream ; and it is the stream and not the eddy that in the end counts.

The main, the essential, the inevitable result of private property is to promote selfishness, for private property creates an artificial environment to which the human type must tend to conform. This artificial environment not only promotes selfishness at large, but tends to degrade every institution which man has invented in his effort to advance. Among these institutions, the two which have sprung from the

noblest instincts in man, and ought most to tend to his improvement, are the institutions of marriage and the Church. And yet both of these are demoralised by the system of private property.

For example, in the state of nature, animals tend to improve through what is called sexual selection. Sexual selection is best illustrated by the fight between males for the female, the result of which is that the strongest males are the ones that perpetuate the type.

In the artificial environment produced by private property, a very different process is at work. Marriage tends to be determined by wealth rather than by fitness; and the wealthy tend to have few children or none; whereas it is found that in the unwealthy classes the poorest have the most children. Well-to-do people protect themselves and their families from poverty by prudence, whereas those who despair of escaping from poverty have no reason for refusing themselves what is often their only satisfaction; and the result is that while the houses of the rich tend to be desolate through childlessness, those of the poor are crowded with the offspring of despair.

Then, too, the religious conception of marriage that it is a sacrament has become practically obsolete; particularly is this so among the rich, whose daughters are annually offered for sale in the market of Mayfair as shamelessly as not long ago were Circassian girls in that of Istamboul.

The effect of private property on the Church is no less deplorable. It costs money to maintain a church; and the more splendidly a church is maintained the

more money it costs. The priest has to live ; bishops indeed have to live in a certain state. The Church, then, must have money. In some countries the Church secures money from the Government, and is driven thereby into the questionable field of politics ; in others, every individual church is thrown upon its own resources, and has either to make its services attractive by ritual, or to depend for its supplies upon one or two of the wealthy members of its congregation. Is it surprising, then, that under this subjection to wealth, Christians have long ago abandoned the teaching of Christ, and forgotten that in early days they, in very fact, sold all and gave to the poor, contributed their earnings to a common stock, and resisted not evil but overcame evil with good ?

And yet the Church has rendered, and is still rendering, a priceless service to man. Falter though she may, she has preserved for us the Gospel of Christ, and contritely praying that she be forgiven her own trespasses, secured for us that we too be forgiven ours.

Let us not judge harshly ; let us rather humbly recognise that we are all beset by difficulties on every side, and diligently study these difficulties, that we may perhaps help to diminish them.

The blame rests not with the Church, but with the artificial environment which man has himself created, and to which he alone can put an end—that is to say, the environment that appeals to the selfishness of man, and having made man selfish, insolently asserts that in no other environment can he be otherwise.

Man will be what his environment makes him.

If the environment stimulates selfishness, man will be selfish.

If, on the contrary, it stimulates unselfishness, he will be unselfish.

Can man by art or wisdom so alter his environment that it will elicit the noble in man, or must it always elicit rather the base ?

This is the question that a completed study of human environment and economics will help us to solve.

We are now in a position where we can usefully sum up the differences between Human and Natural Evolution, and arrive at some conclusion regarding the part man has played, and may still play, in his own advancement.

Before the advent of man animal life prospered or degenerated according as the Natural Environment was favourable to progress or degeneration. The process of evolution was necessarily unconscious and undeliberate.

With the advent of man a new force appeared upon the face of the world. This new force was the power to modify the environment so as to make it serve human needs, and accord with human intention.

Thus before the advent of man, selection was exercised by Nature or the Natural Environment; since the advent of man it is man who has selected and not Nature; animals dangerous and useless to man have almost disappeared except in museums;

and only those that are useful to him are allowed to survive.

Climate is no longer paramount ; on the contrary, man by the use of tools, clothing, architecture, and other arts, contrives to-day to live luxuriously in climates which were once fatal to his advancement.

By increase of knowledge man has acquired a control of the forces of Nature, which makes him now a master where he was once a slave.

By increase of self-restraint—and self-restraint involves the subjection of natural instincts—man has developed qualities which permit of social existence unknown in any other race.

Without having lost the self-reliance that characterises the solitary carnivora, he has, by resisting Nature—that is to say, by such artificial institutions as that of marriage, and by the education which results from family relations, developed all the social virtues. Ferocity has been tempered ; lust has been reduced to subjection ; in the place of the one we now see courage ; in the place of the other chastity ; Craft is growing into Wisdom ; Fear into Reverence. He has substituted for the standard of Nature the standard of Morality, and the substitution of the standard of Morality for the standard of Nature has permitted men and women to live in the same community safe from the ferocity that drives the larger carnivora to solitude, and from the massacre and mutilation which characterise such natural communities as those of Ants and Bees.

When from this point of view we compare man with the lower animals, so immense is his progress



that we are tempted to believe perfection within the reach of his attainment.

Two things, however, suffice to keep alive evil in man :

While at almost every point he has moulded his own environment so as to eliminate the vices that characterise the rest of the animal kingdom, in two respects the predatory system still prevails :

The international conflict keeps nations in perpetual competition with one another, and this competition with one another periodically forces them to war ; and the intra-national conflict keeps individuals in perpetual conflict with one another, and stimulates all the vices which most interfere with human happiness.

The international conflict seems doomed to continue so long as man remains separated by racial antipathies and commercial interests. Efforts are being made to diminish occasions for war to the utmost possible ; but even though racial antipathies were eliminated by bringing all races to recognise and aim at the same social ideal, there would still remain ample occasion for war so long as men are kept in competition by conflicting commercial interests. The task first in importance and time, therefore, seems to be to eliminate, if possible, the commercial and industrial conflict which has been already pointed out to be the great intra-national obstacle to human perfection and happiness.

Now the intra-national conflict has been seen to result from the institution of Private Property. It is only after a study of our economic conditions that the *rôle* of Private Property in the past and future



can be accurately defined or predicted. Suffice it at this moment to point out that Private Property, as at present organised, is an artificial creation of man ; that, indispensable though it may have been to the gradual evolution of the race, it has always acted, and must always act, to keep alive in man the very quality—selfishness—the elimination of which is most essential to the happiness of a community, and the absence of which particularly characterises natural communities such as those of Ants and Bees.

While, then, man has resisted and in great part subdued Nature in the physical world by science, and in a world which he has himself created—the moral world—by self-restraint, he has nevertheless added to this Artificial Environment two institutions which tend to counter-balance the advantages already secured. These institutions are National governments that create International conflict, and Private Property that creates Intra-national conflict ; and we are confronted with the problem whether these two hot-houses of crime, hatred, selfishness and vice can to any extent be dispensed with.

Science affords us the encouraging hope that they can. It points out that man has already suppressed many of the most merciless effects of the Natural Environment ; that by virtue of the Divine Power through which he can in great part create and certainly modify his own environment, he may still further push on the work of civilisation if he will but recognise that the real enemy to human happiness is Hatred and the real friend to it Solidarity ; and if he will return to the Gospel of Christ, which

economic conditions have so far compelled him to disregard.

How far economic conditions are responsible for our backsliding, and for the unhappiness and injustice that result therefrom, becomes the next subject of our inquiry. But before closing the study of evolution it is proper to point out that we are now in a position to dispose of the contention that, because Natural Evolution proceeds upon the principle of the survival of the fittest, therefore Human Evolution must proceed upon the same lines. This is the argument that millionaires and individualists set up against those who believe in the possibility of diminishing human misery by reducing the occasions for human conflict.

It is totally false.

Man has already demonstrated his ability to resist Nature and to progress along lines that are diametrically opposed to those of Natural Evolution. The whole fabric of Human Civilisation is an answer to the millionaire's argument. The natural principle of the survival of the fittest is no longer at work. Man has put an end to it. The lion and the tiger no longer reign in the jungle nor the white ant in the Pampas. Man, and man alone, determines which animals shall live and which shall disappear. The weak in our own race no longer perish; mercy comes to their rescue. The strong are no longer the only ones to perpetuate the type; marriage protects the weak husband in his marital rights as well as the strong. Climate no longer determines survival; man has made himself master of climate,

and indeed works most effectually to-day in latitudes which at an earlier stage were peopled only by savages.

At every point where man touches Nature he has reversed the natural process.

The unfit no longer perish ; the fit no longer alone survive. Man is no longer the necessary result of the natural environment ; he makes his own environment ; and if he be wise enough he can so modify his own environment as to modify himself in accordance with it. When, if ever, he so modifies it as to eliminate those elements in it which stimulate vice, then he will have realised the word of the Gospel, "Ye are Gods."

The denial of the power of man to make an environment that will stimulate morality is a denial of the Godhead of man.

The assertion of this power is an assertion of the Godhead of man.

It is the first article of the New Faith.

#### D. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

It has been already intimated that the poverty and subjection of the worker is not a matter over which the employer has unlimited control ; or one which the worker can by organisation in Trade Unions altogether correct.

If the worker is to improve his condition, he will do so only after he has learned what is the real enemy to his advancement. No efforts that he can make in ignorance of the real enemy will permanently benefit him.

Let us now, in the interests of workers, study existing economic conditions with a view to forcing their real enemy into the open. Then only can we hope successfully to fight him.

The method which civilised man has adopted to secure for himself the necessities and comforts of life may be described as one of free competition ; that is to say, every man is free to adopt whatever kind of work he likes, and to get the largest price he can for it. This plan, in some respects, works exceedingly well ; it is governed by a natural law of supply and demand, which tends to prevent too many men from adopting the same occupation or any one man from getting more than he ought for his work ; for if too many men adopt any given occupation, they will soon discover that there is not enough demand for their work and some of them will abandon it for one more profitable ; and if any man gets too high a price for his work, others will be attracted to this kind of work, and competition between them will reduce prices. In other words, in every community there is at every given moment a given demand for every commodity ; if the supply of this commodity be greater than the demand, the price of it will fall ; if the supply be less than the demand, the price will rise. If the price falls, some people will abandon the work of producing this commodity ; the supply of it will diminish, and prices therefore will rise. If the price rises too high, people will be attracted by the high price to the work of furnishing the commodity, and then prices will fall.

This law of supply and demand applies equally to labour and to the products of labour; that is to say, equally to wages and to wheat. The price a man can get for his labour under this system of free competition depends upon the demand for it; and as the place where all commodities, whether labour or the products of labour, are exchanged is called the Market, the price of commodities is said to depend upon the Market.

The operation of this law of supply and demand is automatic; it depends upon the arbitrary will of no man or set of men; it is as certain as beneficial, and as pitiless in its effects as the law that determines the rise and fall of ocean tides. Many political economists who regard the interference of Government as the greatest evil that can happen to a community, are never tired of extolling the certain and automatic action of supply and demand, because the prices of commodities being determined by a law the working of which all can, if they will, understand, all men are upon an equal footing; and the system secures what the individualist regards as the ideal of justice; that is to say, "that the superior shall have the good of his superiority, and the inferior the evil of his inferiority."

It must be admitted that the system possesses many of the beauties that characterise the economy of Nature; and indeed, the economy of Nature is beautiful in the extreme. The sun draws the vapour of pure water from the salt ocean; lifts it high into the air, wafts it by propitious breezes to the continent; sheds it in beneficent rain upon the thirsty land, and

deposits it in gigantic reservoirs of ice and snow upon our mountain heights ; there is the supply upon which during hot summers we depend ; and the hotter the summer, and the more therefore we need moisture, the more the snow and glaciers melt and furnish us with torrents of refreshing streams ; so that at last the vapour that has been drawn by the sun from the ocean, in obedience to the inevitable law of gravitation, returns to it in a thousand rivers, after having performed its function of nutrition and refreshment on the way.

Just in the same fashion Demand is ever beckoning labour and capital to seek new fields, tempting them from the dead level of the mass up to high levels of profit ; and Supply, increasing through their efforts, is for ever bringing them back, like the force of gravitation, to the point whence they started ; and the cycle is repeated over and over again, performing its mission of production and distribution on the way.

Unfortunately, Nature though beneficial in the main, does not accomplish its work without distressing incidents. Breezes are not always propitious ; they even sometimes create disastrous havoc ; torrents are sometimes more than refreshing, and summers unduly hot. And so man has found it necessary to protect himself by precautions of his own. He dikes in the turbulent torrent to protect himself from inundation, and builds reservoirs and irrigating ditches to protect himself from drought. So also he has found the law of supply and demand proceed sometimes in a method so fatal that he has had to invent contrivances for correcting it ; workers have had to protect themselves

by the organisation of Trade Unions, and capitalists by combination in Trusts. In other words, in Economics, as everywhere else, Man has had to modify natural tendencies by the application thereto of ART.

For example, the more abundant a crop is, the more prosperous the country which grows the crop ought to that extent to be; but it sometimes happens that in such case, prices fall so low as to bring disaster to those who have grown it.<sup>1</sup>

Generally speaking, however, the law of supply and demand by lowering the price of a crop benefits the community at large without ruining the farmer, for the farmer generally recovers loss on price by gain in amount.

There is one commodity, however—Labour—and Labour is in one sense the most important commodity of all—upon which the uncontrolled application of the law of supply and demand exercises the most pernicious influence. For when the supply of labour is large, and the factories are running at low capacity; that is to say, when there are men and women seeking employment, and the demand for labour is small, the effect of this law is to reduce wages below the rate necessary to support life; the unemployed are then reduced to a choice between the almshouse and starvation.

And this evil consequence is a matter over which employers have little or no control; for the very same cause that reduces wages reduces also the

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 170: "And to-day the South is proposing to burn cotton so as to keep up its price." See *New York Times*, January, 1905.



prices of goods. It is because the demand for goods is small that the manufacturer has to run his factory at a reduced capacity; and the demand being small, the manufacturer cannot get a remunerative price for his goods. Now the thing that reduces prices is competition, and the thing that reduces wages is competition, and the main source of every financial, commercial, and industrial disaster is competition. For employer and employee are all alike subjected to the same levelling principle. The moment a particular manufacture is found to be profitable, and therefore able to pay a high rate of wages, new factories are started by capitalists, and prices reduced by the competition of these capitalists; so also working men are attracted to the profitable industry by the high rate of wages, and wages are reduced by the competition of working men. The flow to this industry, therefore, of both capital and labour inevitably reduces not only wages by the direct competition between working men, but also the profit out of which high wages were originally paid.

Employer, therefore, and employee are both slaves of the Market; the employer cannot get more than the Market price for his goods, and out of this price he has to pay for his raw material, the cost of running the factory and the wages of his men. He cannot reduce the price of raw material nor the cost of running the factory—such as rent, fuel, etc.; these, too, are determined by the Market; the only thing he can reduce is wages; so he is driven to reduce wages or close his factory, for he cannot long run his factory at a loss.



The foregoing must not be understood to mean that employers never reduce wages except when they must, or that they never pay less wages than they can afford. On the contrary, the temptation to pay the working man the least possible wage, even when profits are high, is seldom resisted. Indeed, the employers argue in defence of so doing that, as industry is exposed to periodic depression of prices, they must make enough in prosperous years to enable them to keep the factory at work during the years that are not prosperous; they point out that it is to the best interest of labour that they should do this; for if they do not accumulate profits during prosperous years they would have to shut down at the first unprosperous one, and this would be the worst thing that could happen to labour. So the employer has an excellent reason for keeping wages low; in times of prosperity to accumulate a fund out of which to pay wages when prices go down; and in time of depression because prices are down and do not permit of high wages.

It turns out, therefore, that although employers are often insincere and unfair in the rate of wages they impose on labour, there is in the very nature of the competitive system a perpetual tendency to keep down wages, against which labour, whether organised or unorganised, is helpless; and this is true, even when employers are neither insincere nor unfair. They are themselves victims of the same depressing tendency.

There is no one thing more important for the worker to bear in mind than this: That competition

bears as forcibly upon his employer as upon himself. It is true that upon the employer, who is generally a capitalist, the effect of low prices is seldom more than to put a temporary stop to his accumulation of profits; whereas the effect upon the working man is misery and humiliation. For this reason the working man is far more entitled to sympathy and redress than the employer; but it must not be forgotten that the employer is not always a capitalist himself; he sometimes depends upon borrowed money; in such case he *cannot* pay higher wages than prices permit. And when he does not depend on borrowed money, if depression lasts long enough, his capital becomes at last depleted and he is ruined. The Bankruptcy Court bears ample testimony to the helplessness of employers as well as employees.

This subject is of importance to the worker, not only because a proper understanding of it is essential to a determination of the question how he can ever hope to secure justice and freedom, but also because until that day of salvation comes (and it is probably still far off) he cannot, without a proper understanding of it, know when he can afford to demand higher wages from his employer, and when, on the contrary, it is folly in his own interest to do so. For example, the Trade Unions in England for years succeeded in raising wages by the completeness of their organisation and the power secured thereby to demand a fair wage, but their demands became at last more than the market could bear; and the Lock Out of the Engineers in 1897 is an illustration not only of the limitation of the power of Trade

Unions, but also of the danger attending ignorance of these limitations; for this ignorance led to a year of misery for the employees, during which England lost the hegemony of the Steel Industry.

For the purpose, therefore, both of avoiding unsuccessful strikes in the immediate future, and of understanding how alone the working man can eventually free himself from his present economic bondage, it is worth while studying the experience of labour in the past; for it is from actual facts alone that positive conclusions can be drawn; and although this book does not attempt to furnish even an outline of the whole field of political economy, it will endeavour to set forth all the facts essential to a sound view of this all-important subject. A few pages will therefore now be devoted to a study of private property, which stands at the foundation of the competitive system.

#### E. EVOLUTION OF THE NOTION OF PROPERTY

The institution of private property and the competitive system are not the result of accident; nor are they wickedly designed by a few men to secure wealth at the expense of the many. They seem rather to constitute a necessary phase in Economic Evolution.

For example, the carnivore has a fierce sense of property in the game he kills; he will fight for it to the last drop of his blood. The male has a sense of property in the female he wins by battle with other males. Property, therefore, is the right every animal

claims in a thing secured by labour or conquest; the same power that kills game will be used to defend it; those animals alone survive which can defend game as well as kill it. The notion of property, therefore, is at the very foundation of the predatory system, and to the extent to which the predatory system prevails in a community the notion of private property will prevail in it.

When animals herd, the notion of private property tends to be replaced by that of community property. Bees gather honey, not for their own use, but for the common use of the whole hive. Every activity in an ant's nest is directed to the welfare of the whole community; and one community will savagely defend its nest against the encroachment of ants belonging to another community.

We find, therefore, in Nature two opposite and almost inconsistent notions of property; that of private property that characterises solitary carnivora, and that of community property that characterises communities of ants and bees.

The history of man shows that he has at various periods tried both systems, and that to-day he actually employs both systems at the same time. Thus the ancients used to till the ground in common, and to-day the community system is still traceable in rights of common pasture. Indeed, our public parks and such Government monopolies as the Post Office are communistic, for they involve the setting apart of land in one case and labour in the other for common benefit.

But man seems by nature to possess the predatory

temperament far more than the communistic ; for civilisation has proceeded mainly upon the predatory plan. Just as wolves, when they unite to hunt in packs, tacitly agree not to fight amongst themselves so long as the hunt lasts, men early found it convenient, and even necessary, to come to an understanding regarding the recognition by all of the rights of each in the product of his labour or his chase. Indeed, the earliest to come to a complete understanding on this subject prevailed in the struggle for life against those who did not. For among tribes which respected private property, every individual was encouraged to till the ground, set aside harvest, improve weapons, and otherwise accumulate the useful things which constitute wealth. And in the struggle for life, the wealthiest tribe is likely to prevail so long as wealth is applied to improve the race, and not, as ultimately happens, to corrupt it.

The fact that man has adopted the competitive system is itself an indication of temperament that cannot be neglected ; it indicates that he belongs to the predatory races ; that he is actuated by the selfishness that characterises the carnivora, of which indeed he is the chief, rather than by the unselfishness that characterises the bee and the ant. He could not, therefore, develop successfully upon any other lines than those we see him follow in the pages of history ; that is to say, on the lines of respect for private property. The strongest men physically and intellectually led the tribe ; they persuaded the tribe that they were kin to the gods, and were

respected as such; they founded upon this idea the aristocracy of birth that has survived to this day in England; indeed the aristocracy of birth that dominated the first civilisation of Rome, with its hordes of slaves and crowds of *clientes*, constituted as oppressive a tyranny, even under a Republican form of government, as the world has ever seen.

But the very aggressive temperament that sets the aristocrat to leading his own tribe sets him also to conquer his neighbours. To fight successfully, he needs help more virile than can be secured from unwilling slaves or subservient *clientes*; and so there necessarily gathers about the successful aristocrat a new body of men, which in Rome was called the Plebs. This virile Plebs eventually demanded more rights and a larger share of conquest than the aristocrat was willing to accord. There ensued a struggle between the aristocrat and the Plebs, in which wealth played a dominant rôle; for it was the rich members of the Plebs that eventually brought about its emancipation; and so the very respect for private property, which originally set the aristocrat upon the throne, later served to cast him from it. It was such upstarts—"new men" they were called—as Cato, Marius and Cicero—that at last secured the highest functions in the State. Indeed, all through history, we see that the necessity under which laboured the King for money compelled him to address himself to his subjects, and made it possible for them to dictate terms to the King. When, for example, the French King John was taken prisoner by the English at Poitiers, the Royal Exchequer was

emptied by a disastrous war, and the Dauphin was obliged to summon the people and ask them to replenish it. And it was then that the people secured for themselves their first political rights. It was an empty exchequer that drove Louis XVI. to summon the États Généraux in 1789, Charles I. to levy ship money, and George III. the tax on tea; and it was owing to the institution of private property that the people held the strings of the money-bags, and were able to wrest from the throne their share in the Government.

Private property, then, has served two purposes; it first helped to create a King that led the people to conquest, and then helped the people to shake off the tyranny of the King. It has constituted a necessary phase through which civilisation had, in view of the selfish temperament of man, to pass. The question remains, whether man can, by the application to his institutions of a higher wisdom, fit himself to dispense with it.

We can hardly answer this question till we have studied some of the phases through which civilisation has passed in attempting to avoid the cruel consequences that result from the law of supply and demand on wages. We have seen the rôle private property has played in the political field; let us now study its action in the field of Economics.

The notion of free competition; that is to say, that every man is free to employ his labour as he chooses, to get for his labour as much as he can, and to do what he wills with his own, has by no means always been recognised; and indeed, if we look a little



closely into the actual conditions under which we live, it is no more true to-day than it was in the Middle Ages, when industry and commerce were exclusively confined to corporations and guilds. This notion of free competition prevailed at the beginning of the nineteenth century in fact as well as in theory; but it gave rise to such abuse and misery that although still insisted upon by many, it has been practically for many years in abeyance. Let us consider now just why this theory is radically false, and how it has twice within the last few years been effectually discarded.

In the first place, is there any civilised State in which a man is free to employ his labour as he chooses? Obviously no. There are some savage races still existing which tolerate cannibalism. In these one man is at liberty to employ his labour in capturing another, fattening him, carving and selling him at retail. But these races are almost extinct, and it may be said to be the rule, even amongst barbarians, to put at least this limit upon freedom of labour, that it shall not be employed in killing and eating fellow-men. To cannibals this limitation doubtless seems unfair, and contrary to the law of Nature; but on the whole, it is found that cannibalism interferes with the security of the tribe at large, and the "sacred right of property" is limited so as not to include the killing even of slaves. The next step in civilisation is the abolition of slavery itself. We need not go back many years in our own history to remember the loud outcry made by our Southern Planters when this second limitation was put upon



the "Sacred Right of Property." The Bible itself was quoted, not altogether unsuccessfully, in its defence. But three things combined to put an end to slavery. In the first place, there was a strong religious objection to it in the North. In the second place, there was a vital political issue involved in its discussion; and in the third place, the party that opposed slavery being more powerfully organised because of the very absence of this degrading institution, prevailed in the battlefield over the party that was already weakened by it. And so, because the people had become sufficiently educated to understand that slavery was a bad thing for the community at large, the necessary sacrifice was made, and the political issue decided by no less trenchant a remedy than civil war.

Again, is there any civilised community in which a man may get for his labour as much as he can? Obviously no. A man may not use fraud in selling his labour or his goods. He may not use the duress of a neighbour to enforce his employment. There are certain occupations, such as the practice of law and medicine, which cannot be entered upon without a special preparation therefor, and for which in many countries the remuneration is determined by statute. In other words, the principle is established that the community must, as regards the rewards of labour at certain points, be protected from ingenuity or ignorance.

Again, is there any civilised State in which a man may do what he wills with his own? Obviously no. A man may not erect a nuisance upon his land; in

Ireland he may not charge too high a price for it; and in our country he may not organise a company to buy up competing lines of railroad. He cannot keep property for which the Government has need, and he is obliged to pay his country in the shape of taxes for the security he gets from it—whether he wants this security or not.

A thousand other instances could be given of the recognition of the principle that the community has paramount rights, and that individual rights to property and labour can be exercised only subject to the paramount rights of the community or State.

But we are concerned particularly now with the limitations put upon freedom of competition, and shall therefore here confine ourselves to a study of these.

In the Middle Ages every trade was controlled by a corporation or guild; in order to enter a trade a man had to be admitted to apprenticeship thereto; admission was a matter of favour or payment; he received no wages till after having served his apprenticeship he passed an examination as journeyman first and as master afterwards; he was limited as to the number of hours he could work, and as to the character of work he could do; as to the price he could charge, and as to the quality he furnished for a given price. These guilds, originally constituted to protect all persons engaged in the same trade or industry, became at last such instruments of despotism in France that Louis XVI., in the same year as we were declaring our independence in

America, abolished them on the ground that "God had made the right to labour free, and that this right is the first, the most sacred and the most imprescriptible of all."

Indeed, so intolerable had become the complex regulations of the guild, that Louis XVI. was doubtless right in abolishing them; for the very system adopted to ensure good quality of goods at a low price ended by furnishing only bad quality at a high price; and refusal of admission to the guilds ended by accumulating upon the streets and high-roads a veritable army of vagrants, who were driven by want to the commission of every crime. And so the effort through guilds to ensure a living wage to the workman and a fair price to the consumer ended in the creation of close corporations, controlled by an idle and degenerate oligarchy, which exercised the same effect in the economic field as abuse of power has exercised in the field of politics.

Indeed, the abuses attending guilds so affected the minds of economists that the close of the eighteenth century witnessed the rise of the school of *laissez-faire*, and ushered in a cry for liberty of trade, liberty of labour, and liberty of contract that is still animating the so-called Manchester School to-day. This notion of liberty went so far that laws were passed making all associations or combinations of working men unlawful; and these laws told all the more hardly upon working men because they were enacted just as the introduction of machinery into industry was making association indispensable for their protection. For the artisan of the eighteenth

century worked in his own home with his own tools, but the introduction of machinery, by throwing him out of employment, crowded the labour market, and by substituting expensive machinery worked by steam for cheap tools worked by hand, obliged the artisan to abandon his home and crowd into the only place where employment could then be obtained—the factory.

But it is not necessary to recapitulate the subjection to which the working man was exposed in the early part of the nineteenth century, and the valiant efforts by which they in the first place secured the repeal of the laws forbidding associations, and with incredible patience and skill organised the Trade Unions, which, by fixing a limit to competition between working men, put them in a position of relative equality with their employers. The thing most important to retain is the light thrown by this story upon the real enemy of the working man; for during the first part of the nineteenth century, before working men were united in Trade Unions, the competition between themselves put them at the mercy of the employers. A working man alone, ignorant of the profits earned by the manufacturer, ignorant of the number of working men applying for work, himself hungry, and with a hungry family to support, is no match for an employer with sufficient capital at his disposal, a considerable knowledge of the labour market where he can find men to replace such as ask for a higher wage than he is willing to pay, and with practically no reason to fear hunger or even discomfort either for himself or for those who are dear to him.

But workers, associated together in Trade Unions, with complete knowledge of the labour market, practical control of the supply of labour, and sufficient knowledge of the profits earned by the manufacturer to insist upon their share of them, constitute a power that has succeeded in raising wages every time there was a margin of profit out of which increased wages could be paid.

In other words, Trade Unions have aimed at putting an end to competition between workmen, and have in great part succeeded.

Unfortunately, they cannot as easily put an end to competition between employers which by keeping prices down puts a limit to increase of wages. This is the great fact that workers have to remember in the attempt to solve the labour problem: *The limit to which wages can be raised is inevitably fixed by the level to which competition between employers perpetually tends to reduce prices.* Recent history furnishes us a melancholy demonstration of this rule. During practically the whole of the nineteenth century English trade has been expanding; and expansion means increasing profit, for the larger the business transacted the larger tends to be the profit. And with expanding trade and increasing profit, it has been possible for Trade Unions to demand higher and higher wages; indeed, so continuous was their success, that workers got to think that in Trade Unions they had an instrument by which they they could force wages up to almost any figure—even up to the point where the worker would get his full share of the results of his industry. The

buoyancy of their hopes received a rude shock in 1897 when the most intelligent and best organised of their Trade Unions after a struggle of many months was obliged to admit that the limit of advance of wages in their industry had been reached; for this admission involved a recognition that Trade Unions alone can never secure the enfranchisement of the working man. Competition—the fetich of the Manchester School—reduces the employer himself to the same subjection as the working man. For outside of England, in Germany and the United States, were lurking manufacturers quite able and only too willing to wrest from England her manufacturing business if the English manufacturer would not content himself with a narrow margin of profit, and the English working man with the low rate of wages compelled thereby. So during this long lock out of 1897, the control of the iron and steel industry passed away from England in part to Germany, but chiefly to the United States.

The workers of England have not yet discovered that although doomed to failure in the battle with capital on the economic field, they can easily triumph on the field of politics. But in New Zealand the Trade Unions, on their great defeat in 1890, immediately secured by the vote what they had failed to secure by the strike, and to-day New Zealand is governed by its workers. All that the workers have to do is to agree.

And the employers in the United States have so well understood the evils of competition that they have associated themselves in so-called trusts which

however open to criticism, owing to the financial conditions under which they were founded, have had the undoubted advantage of so reducing competition, and the work and expense that attends competition, as to enable the United States, notwithstanding the higher rates of wages paid here, to compete successfully with England in foreign markets, and even sometimes in her own.

For competition by keeping prices down not only keeps wages low but involves a waste both of labour and of wealth which is almost incalculable.

Another evil consequence of competition in commerce is that it foments war. All efforts to bring about universal peace are hopeless so long as the competitive system prevails in our industries and trade. For it has been already demonstrated that the moment a given industry is known to be profitable, capital flows to that industry and increases the products of that industry beyond the demand. This tendency drives manufacturers to seek foreign markets; and when foreign markets are glutted, to colonisation. England has been colonising under this unconscious impulse for centuries; Russia has been pushing into Manchuria under it; France and Germany into Asia and Africa; and we ourselves are striving for new markets in Hawaii and the Philippines. And in this struggle for markets nations are forced into conflict with one another that cannot but sometimes burst into war. Commerce under the competitive system does not bring Peace but the Sword.



## F. CONCLUSION

And so here at last the real enemy of the working man is forced into the open ; it is not the employer who, whether generous or greedy, is himself the slave of the market ; it is not the worker who keeps out of Trade Unions, for he does so only to escape if he can from the conflict between organised labour and organised capital, which is itself the necessary result of the tyranny of the market ; nor is it capital which, because essential to the employment of labour appears masterful and despotic, but is really the mere product of the Market and its humblest vassal. The real master of us all is the Market—the law of Supply and Demand—which, under the competitive system, sets capital against labour ; whereas, under a rational system they ought, and could be, the closest allies.

It cannot be too often repeated—for it is the lesson our workers must learn if we are ever to be free—however essential Trade Unions have been in the past, and must remain in the future to protect organised labour against ever-encroaching capital, they can never do more than secure the highest wage that the *Market* permits. The moment Trade Unions ask more than the Market permits, they injure the industry upon which they depend ; and in so doing they injure themselves. In a word, the Market—that is to say, Competition, *foreign as well as domestic*, sets a pitiless limit to prices, and keeps the margin of profit so low that it condemns working men to remain for ever on the edge of want.

The real enemy of the working man is *competition*.



And yet if only this competition could be eliminated from our industry and our trade ; if only every nation could produce, not for profit, but for the needs of the citizens the things which its citizens want, how easy it would be for them to exchange the surplus of their products with other nations not under the impulse of necessity or the spur of greed as now, but out of the abundance of the harvest and conformably to convenience and justice !

Such a day may be far off ; most think it will never come ; but it is not the faint-hearted who will effect its coming, but rather those who do not allow their minds to be narrowed by prejudice, or their hearts palsied by fear. If, as a matter of fact, war at home between man and man, and war abroad between nation and nation, is due to our economic conditions, is it not worth while to study these conditions with care, and decide whether indeed competition is indispensable ?

## CHAPTER II

### COMPETITION OR CO-OPERATION

LET us suppose that some few hundred men and women of average intelligence are convinced that competition is a deplorable, wicked and unnecessary evil, and decide that they will abandon their homes and purchase a tract of land in order to try an experiment of co-operative production. Let us suppose that every necessary trade and industry is fully represented by at least three or four, so that they are perfectly equipped to start a self-sustaining colony, and they have means enough not only to purchase land, but to provide themselves with the tools, machinery and live stock necessary to prosperous exploitation. The success of such an experiment can be confidently asserted to depend upon one thing, and almost only one thing—are the colonists selfish or unselfish? If the colonists are unselfish to start with, and their children are equally unselfish, the colony ought to succeed so long as unselfishness prevails; but as soon as selfishness appears to any appreciable degree, the colony must fail; for one carpenter will begin by thinking that the other carpenters suffice to do the work of the colony, and will shirk work; another carpenter will complain

that he is left with too much of the work to do, and the carpentering trade of the colony will be demoralised. The same thing will happen in the other trades and industries, until the whole colony falls to pieces. This is not only theoretically true, but has over and over again actually occurred.

Few are aware how many and how earnest efforts have been made to organise Socialist communities of this character in the early part of the nineteenth century, and particularly in the forties. These efforts were due mainly to two men—Owen and Fourier. Robert Owen had made a fortune in manufacture at New Lanark. He had introduced the system of giving his workmen a share in the profits, and it had produced good results. He believed, therefore, in the possibility of extending the plan of co-operation to the formation of self-supporting communistic colonies. The idea was taken up in America, one of the most conspicuous of these efforts being the purchase of the village of New Harmony by Owen from a religious sect called the Rappites. The property consisted of about 30,000 acres of land; nearly 3,000 acres under cultivation by the society, 19 detached farms, 600 acres of improved land occupied by tenants, some fine orchards, 18 acres of full-bearing vines, and the village, which was a regularly laid-out town, with streets running at right angles to each other, and a public square, around which were large brick edifices, built by the Rappites for churches, schools, and other public purposes.

New Harmony began with a population of 800.

At first all went merry as a marriage-bell, and they adopted a constitution entitled, "The New Harmony Community of Equality," under the control of an Executive Council. Difficulties arose, however, in the Executive Council, and Mr. Owen was entreated to take charge of the control of the community. He did so. Another constitution was prepared, and the management was entrusted to a so-called nucleus of twenty-five men, Mr. Owen reserving the power to veto all admissions to membership. This system, however, did not work better than previous systems no less than three more constitutions were adopted before Owen was obliged to recognise the failure of the experiment.

Eleven efforts were made at Socialism during what may be described as the Owen epoch.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Blue Spring Community, Indiana.—No particulars, except that it lasted but a short time.

Co-operative Society, Pennsylvania.—No particulars.

Coxsackie Community, New York.—Capital "small"; "very much in debt"; duration, between one and two years.

Forrestville Community, Indiana.—"Over 60 members;" 325 acres of land; duration, more than a year.

Franklin Community, New York.—No particulars.

Haverstraw Community, New York.—About 80 members; 120 acres; debt, \$12,000; duration, five months.

Kendal Community, Ohio.—200 members; 200 acres; duration, about two years.

Macluria, Indiana.—1,200 acres; duration, about two years.

New Harmony, Indiana.—900 members; 30,000 acres worth \$150,000; duration, nearly three years.

Nashoba, Tennessee.—15 members; 2,000 acres; duration, about three years.

Yellow Spring Community, Ohio.—75 to 100 families; duration, three months.

The failure of these Owen communities was followed by what may be termed the Fourier period. Thirty-four efforts were made to create phalansteries upon the Fourier system.<sup>1</sup> They included over 5,000 members, they covered nearly 140,000 acres of land, and they all broke up in debt amounting to sums of 20,000 to 40,000 dollars respectively.

<sup>1</sup> Alphadelphia Phalanx, Michigan.—400 or 500 members ; 2,814 acres ; duration, two years and nine months.

Brook Farm, Massachusetts.—115 members ; 200 acres ; duration, five years.

Brook's Experiment, Ohio.—Few members ; no further particulars.

Bureau Co. Phalanx, Illinois.—Small ; no particulars.

Clarkson Industrial Association, New York.—420 members ; 2,000 acres ; duration, from six to nine months.

Clermont Phalanx, Ohio.—120 members ; 900 acres ; debt \$19,000 ; duration, two years or more.

Columbian Phalanx, Ohio.—No particulars.

Garden Grove, Iowa.—No particulars.

Goose Pond Community, Pennsylvania.—60 members ; duration a few months.

Grand Prairie Community, Ohio.—No particulars.

Hopedale, Massachusetts.—200 members ; 500 acres ; duration not stated, but commonly reported to be seventeen or eighteen years.

Integral Phalanx, Illinois.—30 families ; 508 acres ; duration, seventeen months.

Jefferson Co. Industrial Association, New York. — 400 members ; 1,200 acres of land ; duration, a few months.

Lagrange Phalanx, Indiana. — 1,000 acres ; no further particulars.

Leraysville Phalanx, Pennsylvania.—400 members ; 300 acres, duration, eight months.

Marlboro Association, Ohio.—24 members ; had a load of debt ; duration, nearly four years.

M'Kean Company Association, Pennsylvania.—30,000 acres ; no further particulars.

It would be a waste of time to attempt to give a detailed account of these communities. They all started with enthusiasm, and ended in bankruptcy, and the reason is not far to seek. While in almost every community there were one or two members who had a sincere desire to see the experiment succeed out of a belief in the perfectibility of humanity, by far the larger number were inspired

Moorehouse Union, New York.—120 acres ; duration, a few months.

North American Phalanx, New Jersey.—112 members ; 673 acres ; debt, \$17,000 ; duration, twelve years.

Northampton Association, Massachusetts.—130 members ; 500 acres of land ; debt, \$40,000 ; duration, four years.

Ohio Phalanx.—100 members ; 2,200 acres ; deeply in debt ; duration, ten months.

One-Mention (meaning probably one - mind) Community, Pennsylvania.—800 acres ; duration, one year.

Ontario Phalanx, New York.—Brief duration.

Prairie Home Community, Ohio.—500 acres ; debt broke it up ; duration, one year.

Raritan Bay Union, New Jersey.—Few members ; 268 acres.

Sangamon Phalanx, Illinois.—No particulars.

Skaneateles Community, New York.—150 members ; 354 acres ; debt, \$10,000 ; duration, two-and-a-half years.

Social Reform Unity, Pennsylvania.—20 members ; 2,000 acres ; debt, \$2,400 ; duration, about ten months.

Sodus Bay Phalanx, New York.—300 members ; 1,400 acres ; duration, a "short time."

Spring Farm Association, Wisconsin.—10 families ; duration, three years.

Sylvania Association, Pennsylvania.—145 members ; 2,394 acres debt, \$7,900 ; duration, nearly two years.

Trumbull Phalanx, Ohio.—1,500 acres ; duration, two-and-a-half years.

Washtenaw Phalanx, Michigan.—No particulars.

Wisconsin Phalanx.—32 families ; 1,800 acres ; duration, six years.

by a more or less unconscious hope that they would be supported in comparative idleness through the work of their associates. And *as these communities possessed no power of coercion*, but had to depend entirely upon mutual good faith and good-will, and were composed of members who had entered the community with the expectation that it was to furnish them with unlimited leisure, and cost them practically no work, they were doomed in advance. It would seem to result from the failure of all these experiments without a single exception that it is impossible to eliminate the stimulus of personal gain unless coercion can be exercised. The experience, however, of the pauper colonies of Holland and Belgium shows that there is no difficulty in getting paupers to work, although they consist of the laziest of our population, provided only there is in the establishment a dark cell to which they can be condemned in case they refuse. *The dark cell is not used once in a year, and yet its mere existence is sufficient to prevent effort to shirk work*, assisted as it is by the reward given to those who do work with industry.

Although a very little selfishness is fatal to voluntary co-operation, it is probable that very little compulsion is necessary to make co-operative production successful, but in studying this question we must bear in mind that a government which undertakes to dictate to the citizen not only how much work he must do in the day, but also what is the kind of work he is to do, is given a power with which few men in our day could be safely



trusted. Indeed, if our Government were to be suddenly, by the votes of a majority, converted to Socialism, it is difficult to imagine and impossible to describe the confusion that would probably ensue. The mere difficulty of ascribing tasks seems enough of itself in the minds of many to doom such an experiment to failure. This is the reason why the average mind is incapable of understanding Socialism, and why therefore it is discouraging in this generation too extensively to preach it. But this should not prevent our coming to certain inevitable conclusions; such as that competition is a bad and costly thing, and that the more it can be eliminated the better; that it keeps down wages; that it tends to subject the working men to the capitalist; and that it is only by slowly eliminating it that the working man can hope ever to be free.

When we confront the problem: What is the first step to be taken to secure this kind of freedom? we are compelled to admit that neither working men nor farmers, populists nor collectivists are agreed. It is useless to attempt to organise the unwealthy for political ends without coming to a common conclusion upon the programme to be adopted, and it has proved impossible as yet to accomplish this. So long as this division exists amongst us, little or no progress can be made. We are divided by a thousand issues: The great party issue which splits our Trade Unions into Republicans and Democrats; the issue of protection or free trade; the issue of Imperialism; the farmer wants cheap money to pay off his mortgages; the working man wants dear money so that the wages he



gets may have high purchasing power; the collectivist wants the Government to do everything; the individualist wants it, on the contrary, to do the least possible.

So long as we are confused by all these conflicting ideas, it is impossible for any large body of us to agree to a programme upon which we can build a political party. But if, without attempting at this moment to decide issues upon which much can be said on both sides, we diligently and patiently set to work to find out the relative importance of these issues, and above all, to decide the general direction in which we should go, then perhaps it will be easy to agree, not upon a general programme that will comprise all these issues, but upon a limited programme that will confine itself to the most immediately important of them, and will set us at last definitely moving in the true direction.

Now it is believed possible to determine, without a shadow of doubt, what is the general direction in which we should move; and this once determined, it ought not to be difficult to decide what steps should first be taken with a view to moving in this direction. A nation is not like an individual with two legs, each of which is absolutely under his control; it is an extremely complex and composite thing, and moves rather like the *Amœba*, which consists of a mass of gelatinous substance without limbs, and changes place only by protruding a part of itself in the direction it wants to take. After the progressive part has pushed itself ahead, it then has to drag the rest of the body up to the point reached. If the progressive

part gets too far ahead of the rest of the body it thins itself to such an extent that it has not strength enough to pull the rest of the body after it ; then the inert or conservative mass takes its revenge on the progressive part and slowly draws it back. Again the progressive part cannot move too fast, for after it has made a little advance, it must wait there till it has dragged the rest of the community up to the advance gained ; and it is only when the whole community has been dragged up to the point of advance that new progress can be made.

We must not be discouraged, then, if our advance is exceedingly slow ; history teaches us that the communities that move the slowest are those in which the advance gained is the surest ; we have but to glance at the progress of popular government in France and England to be convinced of this. The French arrived at advanced views on the subject of popular government long before the English ; the liberties demanded, and for a few years conceded by the French throne in 1356, far exceeded anything dreamed of in England before the seventeenth century, and yet the British people enjoyed a far larger measure of liberty in the intervening period than the French ; they exacted less than the French, and therefore enjoyed more. Again, the frantic efforts of the French people to secure all their rights at once brought about the horrors of revolution in 1789, only to subject the country to the absolute rule of Bonaparte a few years afterwards. It took three more revolutions in 1830, 1848, and 1871, to obtain such parliamentary government as England had

enjoyed for a century past without even taking the trouble to get rid of the fiction of a King.

We must not be in a hurry: Moses, once he saw the Promised Land, was content to die in the wilderness; Socrates, in the midst of a noble demonstration of the immortality of the soul, drank his cup of poison with a joke to Aesculapius; Christ, His mission hardly begun, sacrificed Himself to the kiss of Iscariot. Such must be the spirit that animates us if we would accomplish the best for all in the best way. If we think only of ourselves, what we do will secure neither happiness to ourselves nor lasting results for anyone; it is what we do for others that brings happiness for ourselves and lasting results to all. Those who have suffered know that so long as the heart seeks to escape from suffering there is no peace; but the moment the heart accepts suffering for itself and seeks to diminish suffering for others a miracle happens; for happiness comes to us through the happiness we secure for others. This is a mystery, but it is the Truth.

If we approach the problem presented by the choice between competition and co-operation in this spirit, then many of the difficulties will vanish away. For in the first place, we shall not be concerned only about raising wages or securing more comforts for ourselves; we shall rather be lifted by the thought that though we may achieve little for ourselves we may achieve much for our children.

In the second place, we shall not want to achieve results at once; we shall be contented if we start the community in the right way; the man who wants to

secure results at once is the selfish man, and co-operation is built on unselfishness—that is to say, the seeking of happiness for ourselves through the happiness of others.

In the third place, we shall take the trouble to learn and think; for without knowledge and thought no sound solution can be arrived at.

These preliminary observations concluded, let us now consider the extent to which co-operation can be made to replace competition.

There are as many different methods proposed of substituting co-operation for competition as there are differences of imagination and temperament in man. Socialism, Collectivism, Communism are various names given to these methods, and of each of these there is an infinite variety. No attempt will be made to explain these different varieties; our study will be confined to the question how far co-operation can replace competition to the extent necessary in order to free the working man from subjection to capital, and assure him a fair and certain share in the product of his labour.

To effect these two ends it is by no means necessary to insist on substituting the despotism of the State for the despotism of Capital; a mere change of masters, even though the second master were more under our control than the first, would hardly satisfy a man who is seeking to be free. The problem, then, consists in determining just how much the functions of the State must be extended in order to effect these ends without abridging human freedom any more

than is indispensable therefor; and in view of the objection so often urged against all doctrine that sounds like Socialism that it would abridge the most precious of all our privileges—individual liberty—let us begin by coming to some conclusion as to just what individual liberty is. Then, and then only, can we decide how much, if at all, it would be diminished or menaced by a co-operative form of government.

#### A. LIBERTY

A savage, alone in the woods, enjoys the greatest freedom conceivable in this world. But even this freedom is by no means absolute; he is not free to lie down all day and do nothing, he must provide himself with food. When the weather is bad he must provide himself with shelter. So the need for food and shelter limits the freedom even of a solitary savage, and this need will always constitute a necessary limit to freedom from which no schemes of Socialism can ever escape. But this is not all; man has certain social needs almost as imperative as the need for food and shelter. First and foremost comes the need of the male for the female. Now, if he wants to secure and keep a female as his companion he has to take *her* needs into account; and if he has children and is fond of them, he must take *their* needs into account. So also, when for the purpose either of greater personal security or the satisfaction of social instincts, one family associates with other families, each has to take the needs of the others into account; and the more complicated and complete a society, the

more the natural freedom of the savage is abridged by consideration for the needs of the neighbour.

Again, one of the most precious privileges conferred by civilisation is the security it furnishes to every individual that composes it. Watch a monkey who has secured a nut in a monkey cage : as long as he has the nut, and until he has eaten it, he is its slave ; he is pursued by every monkey in the cage, and he can crack the nut only during the momentary intervals between one pursuit and another. This is not what we should regard as a peaceful or happy life, and it suggests to us a very important conclusion regarding freedom that most people who have written on the subject have failed to take into account, namely, that there is a slavery to things as well as a slavery to persons. This slavery to things may be termed Natural Slavery, because it is a part of Nature's scheme : we cannot escape from it ; so long as we live we are subjected to needs such as that of shelter and food ; and it is the effort to satisfy these needs, and to secure ourselves from the pain and even death that result from absence of shelter and food, that has slowly given rise to the institution of private property. Every man wants to be sure that the fruits of his labour will be secured to him ; that no other man will by violence deprive him of it ; and all government may therefore be said to be founded upon the willingness of men to sacrifice a part of their natural freedom in order to enjoy security in respect of life, limb and property.

Now, what is the natural freedom we sacrifice in order to get security from Government ? It will be

found that the natural freedom we sacrifice is for the most part the kind of freedom for which we care least, because we have ourselves become so modified through the environment created by Government that we have lost savage instincts and acquired the instincts of civilised citizens. For example, the savage slew his enemy and took a considerable satisfaction in the act of slaying; he robbed; he satisfied every sexual caprice, and indeed every other caprice, the satisfaction of which we now characterise as crime. And yet to-day working men will not dispute the advantage to society at large, and to themselves as part of society, that crime should be suppressed; few of them seldom or ever want to commit crime; they certainly do not want their neighbours to be allowed to commit it.

Government, then, by suppressing crime, assures to each and all of us security as regards our lives, our limbs, and the fruits of our labour; it has established courts before which contests between individuals are peacefully determined, and prisons in which criminals are peacefully punished; and in the very process of assuring to every man the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of his labour, it has created the institution of private property.

Unfortunately, Government has not achieved these results in the most perfect manner possible; for although it has secured us personal liberty—that is to say, freedom from personal imprisonment or restraint, and political liberty—that is to say, freedom to determine, each man to the extent of his vote, what shall be the nature of our Govern-



ment and who shall be entrusted therewith, there is a third liberty which it has not only failed to secure, but on the contrary, has altogether ignored, namely, economic liberty—that is to say, the liberty by labour to secure a fair share of the products of the earth. In this sense, the savage is in a better position than the citizen, for a savage can hunt and kill what he chooses and when he chooses; he can even till the soil if he knows how; and he can pluck and eat such fruit as Nature furnishes unaided. The citizen can do none of these things; what game is left he cannot trespass on his neighbour's land to hunt; and even upon Government land he may hunt only during a very short specified period, known as the close season, every year; he may not till the soil which is already appropriated; and the land being appropriated, the fruit of unaided Nature belongs to the owner of the land, and for anyone else to pluck or eat it would be a crime. Nay, civilisation has established conventionalities and institutions that bear still more hardly on certain members of the community. A woman who has been betrayed is generally excluded from what is called respectable employment. Men who are not admitted to a Trade Union are sometimes not allowed to work at their trade. When they are, they are not permitted to work as many hours or as hard as they may wish. Last but not least, those who belong to Trade Unions and those who do not, women who are respectable as well as those who are not, capitalists, employers and employees—all—without exception—all—are slaves of the market,



and reduced by competition to a condition which sometimes leaves a margin of subsistence, but sometimes consigns a large part to the bankruptcy court and the poorhouse.

This is *the* source of most of the preventible evil in our State: for if we could eliminate competition, we should put an end to the despotism of the market; and the despotism of the market is the source of every other despotism. This is so important that we shall have to refer to it again later. At the present moment, for the purpose of determining just what liberty is, we shall not do more than point out that, from the beginning of civilisation to this day, man has been moving from one form of necessity and risk to another. In the savage state, he was under the necessity of getting food from day to day under conditions that were precarious and with a security that was relatively small. In the savage state, might is right. In the savage state, the only law in operation is the law of the survival of the fittest. From the moment man undertook to resist the law of natural evolution and to secure food and shelter with less risk and less labour, he entered upon a series of phases, in all of which a very few secured the maximum of liberty and the maximum of security at the expense of all the rest.

The first institution to this end took the form of government under which either one man or a group of men reduced to political subjection all the rest. In the old days this group or aristocracy kept itself in power either by a religious domination, as the priests

did in Egypt, or by a military domination, as the patricians in Rome.

The priest and the soldier continued to govern Europe in the Middle Ages, where they were respectively entrenched behind feudal castles and ecclesiastical privilege. When the artisans were relieved by the Crusades from the most turbulent of the nobility, they organised themselves into guilds, which soon constituted a tyranny as disastrous to all outside the guild as was ever that of the bishop or the lord. But the Revolution which released the working man from the tyranny of the guild subjected him to the tyranny of the market; the tyranny of the market compelled the working man to organise himself into Trade Unions, which, however indispensable, exercise, nevertheless, a control upon working men outside the Union, as well as inside, of which capitalists avail in order to denounce them.

What, then, is the lesson to be derived from this discouraging story?

In the first place, we must begin by recognising that so long as men have needs—and men always will have needs—their freedom is limited by the necessity of devoting a certain amount of time and labour to satisfying them. The more needs a man has, the more time and labour he must devote to satisfying them. The problem of human society is, how to satisfy legitimate needs at the least expense of labour and of time.

In the second place, we have seen that freedom consists practically in every man being at liberty to

do what he wants to do, subject, of course, to the necessity we are under to devote labour and time to the satisfaction of our needs. Obviously, then, the society will be best constituted that enables all its members to do what they want at the least cost of labour and time necessary to the satisfaction of needs. In other words, inasmuch as the only hours in the day, when we are free to do what we want, are our hours of leisure, liberty is, in fact, proportional to leisure ; and from the *economic* point of view, the people is most free which enjoys most leisure, and is under the necessity of devoting least time to the satisfaction of needs.

We have seen that we have practically secured personal liberty or freedom from personal restraint, and that we have the instrument in our hands for securing political liberty, namely, the franchise, but that the vast majority of us are not in the enjoyment of economic liberty at all. And inasmuch as all the waking hours of our day are practically taken up by work, and the duties we owe to Trade Unions, we have no time to devote to the organisation and surveillance necessary in order to render our political franchise effective ; so that, as a matter of fact, we are driven to vote for candidates whom we have not selected, and for the most part, as regards issues, we have not had time to understand.

As a matter of fact, one of the most important issues before the people at the last presidential election was the issue of protection, and there is not one working man in a thousand who has ever enjoyed the leisure necessary to come to a deliberate

opinion on it. Under these circumstances, the franchise becomes a farce.

If, however, it were possible to produce and distribute the things that are needed for our food and clothing with such economy as to leave all of us the hours of leisure that constitute the most essential factor of economic liberty, we should have the time to organise the political party indispensable for enforcing our political views, and for the nomination and election of candidates that have our confidence.

In a word, then, in order to exercise effectually our political franchise, we must have the leisure that can be acquired only by re-organising our economic system, so that the necessities of life will be to the greatest extent possible produced and distributed by the State upon the co-operative plan—that is to say, upon the plan which *because of its economy* will leave to every man the maximum leisure; for leisure has been found to be the essential element of real liberty and to be almost identical with it.

The extent to which State production and State distribution do constitute the most economical system, and how much leisure will result therefrom, is explained further below.

There is an important lesson to be learned from the foregoing study of the nature of Liberty. This lesson is that men are so bound to men by social needs, that failure to recognise these needs cannot but result in misery and degeneration. Indeed, the social bond that unites man to man is in itself of such

essential importance in any study of human progress, and has been so neglected by an important school of political philosophers, that a section will be devoted to it.

## B. SOLIDARITY

We have just seen that although the isolated savage seems to enjoy the maximum of liberty, as a matter of fact, he remains subject to the necessity of providing himself with food and shelter *unaided*; that the fact of his being unaided makes his efforts in getting these things laborious, and condemns him to the maximum of discomfort and the maximum of risk. We have also seen that in proportion as men group themselves together with a view to common action in the securing of food and shelter, both discomfort and risk diminish, so that in the most civilised States they reach a minimum. If, therefore, we confine our attention to the purely economic element in human society—that is to say, to the simple question how men belonging to the same tribe or nation can secure for themselves the greatest comfort with the least risk, we shall have to decide that the countries in which Government most depend on the consent of the governed furnish these things to their people in the greatest degree. Now it is just in these countries that the natural Solidarity of man is most recognised; for it is in them that political equality is admitted in principle if not in fact. We shall see later how ineffectually the principle of Solidarity is actually worked out, even in our so-called Republic. Suffice it at this moment

to point out that, however deficient may be the character of all existing representative governments, the American farmer enjoys more of the comforts of life than the peasant Slav. In other words, to the extent to which man has held out his hand to man, to the extent to which they have co-operated, to that extent they have increased their wealth and comforts respectively. It would be interesting to sketch the slow progress through centuries of this growing sense of Solidarity; but it will not be attempted here, partly because it has often been sketched before, and partly because it is probably a point as to which there is not likely to be much or any dissent. But this it is important to note: that every time there has been progress made in the direction of greater Solidarity, some one has set up the cry that it invaded rights of individual liberty; thus the organisation of the artisan into guilds was violently resisted by both prelate and baron as an infringement of manorial privilege; the organisation of working men in Trade Unions was actually prohibited by law, both in England and France, so sacred were deemed the rights of employers to keep down wages; Factory legislation was denounced as an invasion of the manufacturer's "right to do what he wills with his own"; and Herbert Spencer sets up as the practical conclusion of his political philosophy that the taxpayer should not be called upon to pay for the maintenance of Free Museums, Free Libraries and Free Schools. In other words, those that have secured the lion's share in the good things of this world, set up their enjoyment of this lion's share as

a right, and regard their individual liberty and self-respect as invaded every time these rights are made to yield to the general good.

And yet the slow but sure march of events, in which, if at all on this earth the Power of God can be traced, ends by compelling even human selfishness to yield before the occasionally startling evidence of human Solidarity. When England was slowly awakening to this essential fact in the early part of the nineteenth century, and reform bills were being passed and municipalities organised, repeated efforts were made to induce a Parliament of Land-owners to contribute the sums necessary for rendering sanitary the dwellings of the poor. All failed till the cholera came, with its trenchant argument, to drive home the fact that the health of every member of the community is a matter of concern to every other member of it; and what no appeal to human sympathy could effect in a thousand years, the fear of cholera effected in a single day: a Bill was at once introduced into Parliament, and passed with hardly a dissenting voice.

And so Time is on our side; and from where we least expect it our ally has come, and will again come, to our rescue. Were we ignorant of the story just told, it would be difficult to understand how cholera, from which the poor man suffered most, could turn out in the end to be the poor man's friend. And yet it proved so. And the question we have to decide is, whether we are going to leave the lesson of Solidarity to be taught the rich by so terrible a friend as Pestilence, or whether we shall, by undertaking the



daily task of organisation, secure ourselves the fruits of the lesson without paying for it in the lives of those who are near and dear.

Volumes could be written to illustrate the extent to which the best interests of both rich and poor would be advanced by a more effectual recognition that we are all bound to one another by indissoluble ties, not of blood only, but also of interest; and the most startling conclusion to be drawn from such volumes would be that the rich are as ignorant and as blind to their own interests as ourselves. There is nowhere to-day to be heard any reasonable person contending that the Factory Acts are either unwise or unjust; on the contrary, it is now universally admitted that the better conditions under which the factory hand works to-day have resulted in greater profit to the employer. And yet, if we turn to the newspapers and legislative debates at the time these bills were proposed, we shall find them teem with protests that if enacted they would ruin national industry, drive manufacturers to bankruptcy, and take the bread out of the mouths of the very men in whose interests they were advocated.

The fact is, the employer is ignorant; the capitalist is ignorant; the rich are ignorant; they obey inherited instincts and acquired habits; they cling to what seems to be existing advantage; and it is the workers who must bring it home to them that there is no gulf between employer and employee save that fixed by the folly of man. And in teaching them this lesson we must bear in mind two things: we all of us inherit certain instincts from a carnivorous



ancestry that tend to make us sometimes prefer violence to persuasion; and we all of us have acquired habits that make the wealthy cling nervously to what they have, and the unwealthy grasp impatiently at what they have not. Moreover, in spite of the enormous progress which Solidarity has made in the world, there is one relic of barbarous conditions we still have to remove; and this relic is the competitive system to which the wealthy cling, some because they sincerely believe it to be essential, others because it is the system that keeps them rich, and most because both the temperament they have inherited and the habits they have acquired make it impossible for them to believe in the possibility of any other. To these the words Socialism, Collectivism, Communism are red rags to a bull. And so, partly because these words have been used to cover doctrines considerably different from those proposed in these pages, and partly because the object of this book is to unite our fellow-creatures, and not disunite them, none of these words will be used to describe the ideal form of government to which we may direct our efforts; but the main object to be secured will be described as Solidarity; those who want to secure it as Solidarists, and the doctrine itself as Solidarism. For these words convey no idea that can offend or even be contested; the most rabid individualist will admit that Solidarity is a good thing, *so far as it is practicable*; the most convinced Socialist cannot deny that Solidarity is to be desired to the utmost possible. The question how far it is practicable, and how fast the cause of Solidarity can

be advanced, is the question which will be discussed in the chapter on the Practical Programme.

### C. PRODUCTION AND OVER-PRODUCTION

After the above digression on the subject of Liberty and Solidarity, let us now return to the main subject of the chapter, namely, the issue between competition and co-operation, and let us consider, from another point of view, the particular evil that results from that element in the competitive system which makes the object of manufacture *profit*, whereas the real object of manufacture ought to be *goods*. Upon this point we cannot be too precise: From the point of view of a community at large, the country needs steel for a thousand purposes: for the purpose of railroads, for the purpose of building, for the purpose of machinery, etc., etc.; but the men engaged in the manufacture of steel in America to-day are not animated with the desire to furnish to the community an article so indispensable to their needs; they are animated by one single desire: the desire of making profit.

In order to secure a profit, the price at which the manufacturer sells his goods must be higher than the cost of the manufacture. Now, he may calculate this cost with the utmost accuracy, and nevertheless, a factor over which he has no control may lower the price at which he can sell below what it costs to manufacture. This factor over which he has little or no control is supply and demand. If there is no demand for steel, the manufacture of steel can occasion nothing but loss; and the moment there is

loss, manufacture must stop, for profit is not only the sole object of a manufacturer, but is a necessary condition to his continuance in business.

How little control a manufacturer has over supply and demand is illustrated every day by the shutting down of manufacturies, and the activity of Bankruptcy Courts. Moreover, the uncontrollable nature of supply and demand is one of the essential features of the competitive system ; for no man engaged in the steel trade can know the exact amount of steel required by the whole world, or the exact amount of it which others are manufacturing; he discovers this only in the course of his business by the price he gets for his steel ; if he gets a high price, he knows the demand is greater than the supply ; if he can get only a low price, he knows the demand is diminishing relatively to the supply.

As a matter of fact, a force equally beyond his control is perpetually pushing him to extend his factory : for competition always tends to lower prices, and the manufacturer is therefore driven by diminished profits to extend his business so as to make up by the magnitude of his operations for the small profit on every transaction. The more he extends his business, the more his competitors are tempted to extend for the same reason. There is therefore a perpetual tendency in every business for supply to increase beyond demand. This tendency is corrected in one of four ways.

When the market price gets below cost, the manufacturer must either economise in the cost, or stop work temporarily, or go out of business. He

cannot reduce the price of the raw material, or of rent, or of the coal and other expenses that enter into the working of the factory; the only thing he can reduce is wages. Before working men were organised into Trade Unions, wages tended perpetually under this pressure to be reduced to the starvation level. Now that most of the trades are organised in Unions, the effect of a reduction of wages is generally to occasion a strike. Now a strike, by putting a stop to manufacture, reduces the supply; the reduction of the supply relatively to the demand tends to raise prices, and thus enables the manufacturer to abandon the reduction of wages, which gave rise to the strike. Most working men who have studied the causes of strikes are familiar with this process; a very good illustration of it is found during the early period of the anthracite industry: Whenever the price of coal went down, the mine-owners endeavoured to compensate themselves for low prices by reducing wages. The workmen, who were at that period almost all American, and up to American standards of intelligence, proposed to their employers to stop working the mines, in order, by reducing the supply, to raise prices, and they actually struck for the purpose of compelling the mine-owners to stop over-production. In one instance, the workmen decided to stop, and did stop working for an entire month. Their calculation turned out to be sound; an end was put to the glut which had reduced prices, and at the end of the month they returned to work at the old wages.

The example set by the miners on this occasion is continually followed to-day, so that in the place of

reduction of wages, factory-owners generally propose working on half time, or working only a certain number of days in the week, a plan preferred by working men to a reduction of wages, because manufacturers are always anxious to work full time when business permits it, whereas they never show anxiety to raise wages though business permits it.

A second way in which supply is reduced when it gets out of proper relation to demand is, that the weakest manufacturers are driven by this state of things into bankruptcy, and the shutting down of mills through bankruptcy relieves over-production and restores prices.

A third way in which supply is brought in proper relation to demand is, for the manufacturer to dump the excess into foreign markets at prices lower than the cost. This process is largely resorted to by our large American Trusts, which, rather than consent to a reduction of price in America, get rid of their excess by selling below market price abroad.<sup>1</sup>

However much this dumping into foreign markets may relieve the industry in the country that adopts

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gary, President of the Federal Steel Company, testified before the Industrial Committee (Report of the Industrial Commission, p. 199) that steel had been recently shipped to Japan at a price below the domestic price.

Mr. J. W. Lee, President of the three independent pipe-line organisations, testified that prior to 1895 "oil for export was sold below the cost of crude at the refinery" (Report of the Industrial Commission, p. 121).

Again, at a time when the American trade was paying \$28 for steel rails, the same steel rails were sold in Japan at \$20 (*Monde Economique*, Feb. 20, 1897).

this course, it obviously greatly disturbs, and tends even to ruin the industry in the country in which this excess is dumped. England and Germany are bitterly resenting this process to-day, and measures will probably be taken by prohibitive tariffs to prevent it.

The process, however, is interesting, for it indicates how the relief of the industry in one country is made to ruin the same industry in another.

A fourth method for adjusting supply to demand, and one largely resorted to in America, is a combination of all, or nearly all, manufacturers engaged in the same business.

These combinations, generally known under the name of Trusts—though very erroneously so termed—furnish so admirable an illustration of the waste and evil of competition, that they deserve a section to themselves.

#### D. TRUSTS

The history of trusts in America demonstrates :

1. The inevitable tendency of capital by rushing into industries that are remunerative to occasion over-production.
2. The inevitable tendency of over-production to produce bankruptcy for employers and misery for employees.
3. The inevitable tendency of over-production to produce international complications and even war.

These are the necessary evils of competition demonstrated by the history of trusts ; but the trusts have done more than demonstrate the evils of competition ;

they have also demonstrated the positive advantages obtained by substituting combination or co-operation therefor. These positive advantages can be grouped under one title: Economy of production and distribution. We shall discuss the evils of competition first, and the advantages of co-operation afterwards.

1. THE INEVITABLE TENDENCY OF CAPITAL, BY RUSHING INTO INDUSTRIES THAT ARE REMUNERATIVE, TO PRODUCE OVER-PRODUCTION

No political economist denies the obvious fact that whenever an industry is known to be profitable, capitalists are likely to engage in this industry—indeed, this is one of the great automatic processes which the Manchester School has put forward as constituting the chief merit of the system. It is, of course, important for the community at large that prices should in no one industry become excessive; and obviously the disposition of capital to rush into industries where profits are high, does by competition tend to reduce prices, and thus prevent the prices from becoming excessive. But economists, especially those of the Manchester School, have not been willing to recognise that this disposition of capital to flow into productive enterprises may, though sometimes beneficial, be also sometimes ruinous; may indeed often result in a devastating deluge. These economists, therefore, it may be well to confront with a brief history of one or two of our largest combinations. Let us take as a first example the Sugar Trust.

Just before the organisation of this Trust, over-production had become so excessive that out of



forty refiners in the United States eighteen became bankrupt. Of the twenty-two that remained, eighteen combined. Of these eighteen, eleven refineries were closed, leaving seven to do profitably the work which had previously been done unprofitably by forty.

The history of the Whisky Trust shows over-production to a still more aggravated degree. Before the organisation of the Distilling and Cattle-Feeding Company, several agreements were entered into by the majority of the distillers; under one of them they agreed to reduce production to forty per cent. of what it at that time was; under a subsequent agreement they agreed to reduce still further to twenty-eight per cent.; and out of eighty of the principal distillers who organised the Distilling and Cattle Feeding Company, sixty-eight were closed, leaving only twelve distilleries operating.

The same succession of events is to be found in the history of the American Steel and Wire Company, and indeed of practically all American Trusts.

## 2. THE INEVITABLE TENDENCY OF OVER-PRODUCTION TO PRODUCE BANKRUPTCY FOR EMPLOYERS AND MISERY FOR EMPLOYEES

This inevitable tendency towards over-production vitally concerns working men, for it is upon the working men that the evil consequences of this process first and most fatally fall. For as soon as the process results in the inevitable reduction of prices to near cost price, the manufacturer must



either throw workmen out of employment or reduce wages. The wages of the working man constitute the only elastic element in cost, and it is therefore the working man who first pays for the evil working of this system. And not only does the working man pay for it, but the employer pays for it also, for working men to protect their interests strike, and only the wealthiest employers can stand the strain of a strike ; the rest are ruined by it.

Even a reduction of the hours of work or the days of employment in the week will, if it lasts long enough, ruin the employer, for the employer has still to pay the fixed charges of the factory, and if prices get low enough, and he cannot sell his goods except at a ruinous loss, he ends by not having means enough to pay these charges ; and this process is illustrated in the cases just mentioned ; for example, eighteen out of forty sugar refiners became bankrupt ; and it was not till the eighteen were ruined that a combination was possible amongst the rest.

### 3. THE INEVITABLE TENDENCY OF OVER-PRODUCTION TO PRODUCE INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATIONS AND WAR

It has been already pointed out that one of the methods employed by our great trusts to keep up prices at home is to sell their excess of goods in foreign markets at prices below cost. Obviously, the nations who are the victims of this process are not long going to tolerate it ; but this is a relatively small part of the international complications pro-

duced by over-production. Altogether, the most serious consequence of over-production is that the manufacturers, when they can no longer get a remunerative price for their goods in the home markets, are inevitably driven to seeking this remunerative price elsewhere—that is to say, they seek to secure foreign markets, and failing foreign markets, they seek to secure new markets by colonisation or conquest.

It is impossible to read the history of the British Empire during the last 150 years without becoming persuaded that its so-called greed for conquest inevitably results from the necessity under which English manufacturers have been to secure markets for their increasing goods. Either British factories had to close, and British workmen be thrown out of employment, or England must, whether by colonisation or by conquest, secure a price outside of her own borders for the goods which competition perpetually tended to make her factories over-produce.

Indeed, the war through which England compelled China to purchase Indian Opium looks, upon its face, as the greatest of international crimes, and yet, when we understand this so-called crime of England, it turns out to have been a commercial necessity; for the remunerative prices obtained by the production of opium in India had so developed this branch of business, that millions of Indians depended for their lives upon it, and either Chinese must poison themselves with opium, or Indians must die of hunger. The responsibilities of England were to her subjects

first. The Chinese had to pay the price of this responsibility.

No better illustration of the wicked despotism that results from existing industrial conditions would be given than this; it brought about a condition of things under which either England must commit a crime in China, or millions of her subjects must perish in Hindustan.

Let us now turn from the demonstration of the evils that result from the competitive system, as illustrated by trusts, to the positive advantages obtained from co-operation which these combinations have revealed.

## 1. ECONOMY OF PRODUCTION

### (a) *Economy from Waste Products*

There is an economy which results from all concentration of capital, such as the manufacture of waste products. This economy is sometimes of startling importance. The managers of the Standard Oil Trust testify that among the waste products capable of being utilised in sufficiently large refineries are gasoline, paraffine, lubricating oil, vaseline, naphtha, aniline dyes, and no less than two hundred drugs, and that *the total value of these waste products is actually as great as that of the oil itself.*<sup>1</sup>

### (b) *Economy occasioned by Working Factories at Maximum Efficiency*

Under the system of free competition, every factory

<sup>1</sup> Testimony of Mr. Archbold (pp. 570, 571) in the Report of the Industrial Commission.

is subject to variations of demand : at one season the factory is over-worked, at another, it has not enough work to occupy its employees. A factory is working at the maximum profit only when it is working at its highest efficiency ; every factory, therefore, has an interest in working at the highest efficiency. This hardly ever takes place under the régime of free competition except at seasons of extraordinary prosperity. When, however, many factories combine under one management, most of them can be run at maximum efficiency, and the variation in demand can be concentrated upon comparatively few factories. In the case of the Sugar Trust, of the seven refineries which are maintained, six work without interruption at maximum efficiency, and the entire variation is made to fall upon a single refinery—the one in New York.

An incidental economy resulting from this plan is to be found in the fact that the adjustment of the work of a factory to a fluctuating demand is the most difficult part of a manager's task, and the task being difficult it is highly paid ; in other words, if the seven refineries now constituting the Sugar Trust were working under the system of free competition upon their own account, they would each have to pay high prices for this expensive management. By combining these seven factories under one management, the expensive management is confined to a single refinery.

We should under-estimate the economy resulting from this head were we to consider only the seven refineries now constituting the Sugar Trust. It must be remembered that before the Sugar Trust was

organised the number of refineries operating was not seven but forty ; so that under the system of free competition, forty factories were all working under expensive management and at great disadvantage, whereas now the same work is being done by seven refineries, of which six are working at maximum efficiency under the best conditions and without expensive management, and only one is now subjected to the disadvantageous circumstances and expensive management that prior to the combination diminished the profits of everyone of the forty competitors. It has been estimated that the saving to the Sugar Trust arising from this advantage alone is as high at times as one-eighth of a cent. per pound, or \$2.50 per ton. The Sugar Trust refines about 1,800,000 tons per annum, thus making from this source alone an economy, if maintained throughout the year, of about \$4,500,000 per annum.

(c) *Economy of Time in Manufacturing only One Dimension*

In the manufacturing of steel hoops eighty-five different sizes have to be made. When every factory is called upon to fill an order comprising many sizes, much time is lost in changing the rolling machinery from one size to another. Mr. Guthrie, the President of the American Steel Hoop Company, testifies that by specialising products in different plants, an economy of \$1 to \$1.50 per ton is effected.<sup>1</sup> A similar economy is made in the manufacture of shoes and all articles of different dimensions.

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Industrial Commission, pp. 953-957.

## 2. ECONOMY OF DISTRIBUTION

(a) *Cross-Freights*

A refiner of crude petroleum in the Eastern States, in competing with a refiner in Chicago for Western trade, is at a disadvantage owing to the necessity of paying cross-freights—that is to say, he has to pay the cost of transporting crude oil from the wells to New York for refinement, and then the cost of carrying the refined oil back over practically the same ground to the West. When, however, factories in Chicago and New York are put under one management, as in the Standard Oil Trust, these cross-freights are avoided; the crude oil taken to New York is refined for the Eastern market alone, and the Western market is provided with oil refined in Chicago. The salt and the tin-plate trusts, as indeed most of the trusts, effect a great economy in this manner.

(b) *“Getting the Market”*

The expression, “Getting the Market,” is used to cover all the expenses attending the bringing of goods to the attention of the public, and they may be roughly divided into two principal categories—advertising and commercial travellers. The public little appreciates the enormous cost which, under the system of free competition, attends the work of finding a purchaser. Mr. Bradley, after a careful calculation, estimates that “somewhere between the distiller and the consumer in this country forty millions of dollars

are lost ; this goes primarily to the attempt to secure trade.”<sup>1</sup> He testifies that the combination of Kentucky distillers was able to dismiss three hundred salesmen ; the Steel and Wire Trust dismissed two hundred salesmen. Mr. Dowe,<sup>2</sup> the President of the Commercial Travellers’ National League, testifies that thirty-five thousand salesmen have been thrown out of employment by the organisation of trusts, and twenty-five thousand reduced to two-thirds of their previous salaries. This would represent a loss of \$60,000,000 in salaries on a basis of \$1,200 each. He cites, as instances of trusts that have dismissed salesmen, the baking powder, bicycle, chair, paper-bag, rubber, tin-plate, steel and rod, sugar, coffee, thread, and type-founders’ combinations. Not only do trusts dismiss salesmen, but they substitute for salesmen who, prior to the organisation of the trust, had been earning \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year, cheaper salesmen who receive \$18 a week. He also estimates that the dismissal of commercial travellers means a loss to railways of about \$250 per day for 240 days in the year, in all, \$27,000,000. The loss to hotels is about as much, and “many hotels are likely to become bankrupt if any more travellers are taken off.” To Mr. Dowe and the organisation he represents, the dismissal of commercial travellers is of course a disaster ; but from a purely economic point of view, assuming the co-operative system to be a sound one, what is a disaster to the Commercial Travellers’ National League is a benefit to the industry and to

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Industrial Commission, pp. 829-831.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 27-36.



the nation at large, for it represents so much economy realised. This question admirably illustrates how the competitive system sets one group of men in conflict with others without offering any satisfactory solution for the misery which this conflict occasions.

The subject of trusts presents complicated problems when studied from the point of view of human happiness; but it is full of valuable lessons when studied from the point of view of the worker, for it furnishes not only demonstrative proof of the fact that competition is necessarily attended by over-production and waste, but also figures showing the extent of the evil in both cases, and the amazing economy that results from their elimination.

#### E. INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTION AND STATE PRODUCTION

After this short divergence on the subject of Trusts, let us again refer to the main subject of this chapter, namely, the relative merits of competition and co-operation in production and distribution, and let us recall a suggestion heretofore made that one of the great evils attending the competitive system is, that the main object of a manufacturer is not to manufacture goods for the needs of the community, but to make profits for his individual advantage.

The community needs goods; the individual needs profits; but the individual can, under the existing competitive system, furnish the community with goods only upon the condition of making a profit. Here is one of the main sources of the evil of the competitive system. In order to make the profit he



must keep wages low ; in order to make the profit he must seek markets abroad ; in order to make the profit he must drive his country to war, and use the unemployed working man as an excuse for it. If, however, factories were run, not by individuals for profit, but by the Government for satisfying the needs of the community, this main source of evil would disappear. For inasmuch as the Government would manufacture, not for the purpose of profit at all, but merely for the purpose of furnishing the community with the goods it needs, if at a given period more of a particular commodity was manufactured than was necessary, the Government could do one of two things : either store away the surplus or exchange it with other countries for foreign goods. In neither case would the burden fall upon the working man, for as the factory in such community is run for the benefit of the working man as well as for the benefit of all the rest of the population, the prime interest of the Government would be the welfare of the working people ; and the loss, if any, resulting from an excess of manufacture in any one industry would, in a national budget amounting to billions of dollars, be insignificant. It would be supported by the entire nation, and be felt by no one individual of it. A sufficient number of factories would be shut down to prevent the continued excess ; if it were impossible to exchange the excess with foreign nations, those employed in the factory would be given other Government employment.

But the most effectual difference between the economic condition of the State manufacturing with

a view to goods, and that of the individual manufacturing for profit, is that the individual *must* sell (however great the loss) in order to convert goods into cash, of which he has daily need in order to pay wages and the other running expenses of the factory. The State, on the contrary, need never sell; it only distributes; if it has an excess it stores or exchanges, and if there is a deficiency, and only if there is a deficiency, it extends. The State is master where the individual is a slave. And the State is master because not manufacturing for profit it is mistress of the market, mistress of supply through its knowledge of demand, subject no longer to the fluctuations of foreign markets, but calculating in advance the needs of its population as a father calculates in advance the needs of his family, and producing to satisfy these needs which are certain, and not with a view to profit, which is not only uncertain but incalculable and impossible to control.

Again, although the example of the trusts above given will serve to demonstrate in a convincing manner the economy actually occasioned by a few trusts in the few industries affected by them, this economy is minute by the side of that which could be exercised were the work of production and distribution undertaken by the nation at large.

We are all familiar with the amazing results obtained by the national enterprise known under the name of the Post Office, and how, for the insignificant sum of two cents, a letter written in New York can be transported by express train and delivered in an incredibly short space of time

in San Francisco, and even perhaps more incredibly in the heart of the Rocky Mountains.

Let us consider for a moment what would be the cost of doing this were letters distributed throughout the country in the same way as our other commodities are, as for example, milk, coal, or bread. It would be interesting to calculate how many hundred dealers in milk there are in New York or London, each of them equipped with their own horses, waggons, and men, each of them engaged in delivering milk all over the city; add to these the thousands that are engaged in distributing in like manner bread, and add to these the thousands that are engaged in like manner in distributing coal, and so on with butter, eggs, meat, fish, vegetables, and all the other things that enter into our daily consumption.

Every block of houses is served with milk by this large number of milk-dealers instead of by one, as would be the case if the distribution of milk were undertaken by the city; so also every block is furnished with butter, eggs, meat, fish, vegetables by this large number of dealers in butter, eggs, meat, fish, and vegetables, instead of by one, and so on, through every article that enters into our daily use.

Compare with this the economy of time, labour and expense effected by the Government Post Office through sorting letters beforehand according to streets, and confining the distribution in any one street to a single carrier who distributes the letters with the greatest economy of time and labour, from door to door.

The saving to the citizen which would be occasioned by having the necessities of life distributed by the State is a matter of such material importance to him that it seems amazing that he has not taken it into consideration before this.

We organise Trade Unions for the purpose of engaging in a fight with our employers, in which not only our own pockets but our very lives are endangered, a fight which engenders hatred, often results in violence and might eventually culminate in civil war, and yet it has never occurred to us to organise ourselves into a political party that will institute and secure the distribution of the necessities of life by the State, although such a distribution need involve no hatred, no violence, no war, but would, on the contrary, immediately make for us an economy in our daily expenses of twenty-five to sixty per cent.! And to secure this we have but to make of this question the single issue of our political campaigns.

But economy of distribution is by no means the only economy that would be secured. The competitive system keeps a whole army of able-bodied men engaged in the work of competition, who might, upon a more intelligent system, be engaged in the work of production and distribution.

Let us see if we can form any idea how many are engaged in the wasteful work of competition, and how many, therefore, would, under a system of State production, be set free to relieve the labour of those engaged therein.

It is estimated that out of every one hundred men who start a new business ninety become insolvent.

This means that for every ten who are fit and able to conduct a new business ninety engage in new business who are unable to earn their bread at it; and this furnishes in one class of business men a measure of the wastefulness of the present plan. Under a system of Solidarism the exact number of men necessary to conduct business in any given place could be mathematically determined; and the ninety unsuccessful men who are now engaged in futile efforts to destroy the business of the ten successful men would be employed in production, to their own advantage and to the relief of those already engaged therein. The wastefulness, however, of the present plan is not confined to the fact that many are engaged in attempting to do what can better be done by a few, but also by the fact that in the conflict between the successful, as well as the unsuccessful, a vast horde of men are employed by the mere fact of the competition who would be thrown out of employment, *and therefore be serviceable for production* in case the element of competition were avoided. Amongst the men so employed are commercial travellers; these men occasion waste to the community, not only through the fact that instead of producing themselves, they are living on the production of others, but through the fact that they constitute a large part of the passenger traffic of the country—that is to say, the railroads are put to the expense of carrying these travellers all over the United States in order that they may each have an opportunity in every corner

of the United States of decrying the goods of one another, and exaggerating the merits of their own. And this throws a side-light on the evils of our present plan, for the railroads, under the existing competitive systems, have an interest in encouraging this work ; because if they did not have this horde of commercial travellers to carry about the country, many of them might not be able to pay interest on their bonds ; whereas, if the railroads were owned by a collectivist State, the less passengers they had to carry the richer would be the State. The testimony taken by the Industrial Commission furnishes admirable instances of the waste that attends competitive production, and the corresponding economy that would attend a collectivist system. Mr. Edson Bradley, President of the American Spirits Manufacturing Company, testifies that in the whisky business "somewhere between the distiller and the consumer in this country \$40,000,000 is lost. This goes primarily to the attempt to secure trade." Mr. Dowe, President of the Commercial Travellers' National League, in estimating what he calls the loss to the community due to the dismissal of commercial travellers by the Trust, arrives at the following figures :

35,000 salesmen at an average compensa-				
tion (including commissions of \$3,000				
each a year	...	...	...	\$105,000,000
Loss in railroad travelling	...	...	...	27,000,000
Loss in hotel expenses	...	...	...	27,000,000
				<hr/>
Total	...	...	...	\$159,000,000

In the few industries, therefore, in which competition has been diminished by the trust system, an economy of \$159,000,000 is estimated to have been already effected. These figures enable us to appreciate the enormous economy that would result from an elimination of competition from every industry. It is important to note that an economy that constitutes a loss to commercial travellers, railroads, and hotels under the competitive system, would constitute a pure gain under a system of Solidarism; for it would mean so much less work for railroads and hotels, and so much more labour for production. And it will be shown presently that the more hands are free to do the work of production for a given population, the less time each will have to work. Our present system, then, encourages useless expenditure, whereas Solidarism would secure an equivalent economy.

Another important economy would be made, too, in the running of public enterprises, through the absence of the necessity of collecting revenue therefrom. In municipal tramways, for example, no less than one-half the force could be dispensed with; for the functions of the conductor are practically confined to collecting fares. A similar economy would be practised on railroads; in telegrams; no stamps would be required for postage; no costly corps of clerks for book-keeping.

Another sort of bootless expense to the community arises from advertising. Mr. P. Magnuson, quoted by Professor Ely,<sup>1</sup> has estimated that five hundred million

<sup>1</sup> "Socialism and Social Reform," p. 122.



dollars a year are spent in advertising; whereas the cost of conveying the useful information given by advertising would not amount to more than five millions. The labour of all the men and all the wealth employed in this work of advertising, estimated together at four hundred and ninety five millions a year, would be saved in a Solidarist State.

Under our system, gas is furnished to our cities by gas companies, each one of which tears up the streets to the great detriment of public convenience and public health, in order to lay its mains for the mere purpose of competing with existing companies, but only with the result of forcing a consolidation which tends to make gas dearer instead of cheaper to the consumer. Professor Ely estimates that the consolidation of gas companies in Baltimore has cost eighteen millions, of which ten millions represent pure loss.

Very much the same thing is true of railroads. Professor Ely quotes a railroad manager who claims that if the railways of the United States were managed as a unit instead of by competing companies, such management would effect an economy of two hundred millions of dollars a year; he cites, as an instance of useless paralleling of roads, the numerous railroads which connect New York with Chicago. He estimates that these lines cost two hundred millions of dollars, and that the maintenance of the useless lines involves perpetual loss. He is obliged, however, to admit that in this case there is a considerable accommodation, owing to the fact that the parallel lines pass through different places and occasion some advantage in the time-table.



This, however, is not the case with many other lines in the United States. The Colorado Midland parallels the Denver and Rio Grande, passing through the same places, and, inasmuch as both are subjected to the necessity of connecting and forwarding passengers to and from lines at their extremities, both are obliged to run trains at the same hours. There is in this case no advantage either to the time-table or to new places.

Nor does the paralleling and competition of parallel roads always furnish better accommodation to the public. Between Chicago and Denver there is one line able easily to run trains from place to place in twenty-four hours; but for the purpose of avoiding freight-war with the competing lines it entered into an arrangement with them, under which it agreed not to run passenger trains in less time than thirty-six hours. The public, therefore, instead of gaining, lost an advantage of twelve hours by this arrangement, thereby learning at no small inconvenience that competition does not always compete.

What is true of railroads and gas companies is also true of telegraph business. The Western Union is capitalised at one hundred million dollars. It is estimated that the cost of laying the lines actually used by the Western Union would be twenty millions; eighty million dollars, therefore, have been wasted by the existing system which encourages private companies to construct lines for the purpose or with the result of compelling other companies to buy them up. Professor Ely adds that "it cost

England nearly as much to make the telegraph a part of the Post Office as it did all the other countries of Europe put together, because in these the telegraph had been from the beginning a part of the Post Office, and the wastes of competition had been avoided."<sup>1</sup>

Not only is there great waste of labour in the business of producing and distributing the necessities of life under the competitive system, but the competitive system creates a large class of business that absorbs much of the wealth of the community, and employs a very large number of its members. For example, under a system of Government Ownership, there would no longer be any necessity or advantage in insurance, whether against life or against fire, or against accident, or against hail, or against defective title, or against any other cause. The reason of this is obvious. We insure ourselves against pecuniary loss arising out of these accidents, because otherwise the whole loss will fall upon ourselves. Under a system of Solidarism some of these occasions for loss would not exist at all, and those that did exist would fall upon the entire State, and would consequently be inappreciable by any one member of it. For example, a man insures his life so that his children be not reduced to poverty by his death; but under a system of Solidarism the widow and the child are provided for, being all of them members of the State, and therefore all of them sharers in its income. Death in such a case would practically not constitute a loss at all; it would rather constitute a gain to the State financially, because the

<sup>1</sup> "Socialism and Social Reform," p. 120.

number of deaths of the very old and the very young—and therefore of the unproductive members of the community—is known to be far greater than that of its productive members. We can, to a certain extent, measure the economy that would result to the State from an elimination of insurance by a reference to the insurance reports of the State of New York, and to the amount of capital invested therein.<sup>1</sup> The capital invested in life and casualty insurance companies alone doing business in the State of New York is \$2,226,432,202.40,<sup>2</sup> over two billion, two hundred and twenty millions of dollars; it increased during the single year of 1903, \$163,992,398.11; so that, assuming that the average working man earns \$2.00 a day, over eighty-one million working days were wasted in life insurance alone in a single year; or, taking three hundred and thirteen days to represent the working days in a year, the whole labour of over 248,000 men was lost to the nation in 1897 through the wasteful necessity of life insurance alone. And to this must be added the time devoted to life insurance during the year of all the officers, actuaries, book-keepers, clerks, and the host of agents who have become proverbial for the extent to which they worry and annoy us.

Another kind of business that would be eliminated under a system of Solidarism is the class of brokers, not only Wall Street brokers, but real

<sup>1</sup> Capital is taken as the measure because it represents the accumulation of premiums paid for the benefit of insurance.

<sup>2</sup> Report of the State Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York for 1904.

estate brokers, mining brokers, and brokers of every description.

And there is another large class of intelligent men who are now engaged in fighting the quarrels which result from the competitive system who would be left without an occupation under a system of Solidarism, namely, the lawyers. With them, the hatred and vindictiveness which arise from litigation would, under a system of Solidarism, in great part disappear also; for lawyers constitute the class whose business it is to conduct these quarrels, and alas! also to inflame them. When we take into consideration the fact that in the city of New York alone there are nearly ten thousand practising lawyers, and when we add to these the clerks, stenographers, book-keepers, and office boys employed by each of these ten thousand lawyers, those employed in the courts, the sheriff's office, the county clerk's office, marshals, deputy sheriffs, and others; and when we take into account that most of these men are engaged in the business of fighting, we cannot but be struck by the enormous advantage to the community of a system which would practically eliminate the necessity for this fighting altogether.

It must not be understood to mean, however, that there would be no necessity for courts under a system of Solidarism. Even though crimes against property were eliminated by Solidarism, there would still be a temptation to commit crime owing to sexual jealousy, and in a certain degree to intemperance and idleness. It is believed that both intemperance and idleness

would tend to diminish with the disappearance of the misery that reduces men to the physical condition that engenders them; but there would still, doubtless, be some intemperance and some idleness; there would certainly remain unhappy marriages; and as every man is to remain possessed of all his purely personal effects, such as furniture, works of art, instruments of pleasure, etc., there would be minute questions of property sometimes involved. But it is hardly conceivable that such questions could involve any system of justice more elaborate than that of the justice of the peace and possibly a single court of appeal. The absence of competition would so simplify the law that no question would be likely to arise that the parties to the litigation could not themselves explain. How little litigation would be likely under a system of Solidarism may be judged by comparing the litigation to which the administration of the Post Office gives rise with the interminable lawsuits which result from the administration of railroads.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it is to be hoped that under a system of Solidarism, the community would at last have leisure to study criminology, and learn to understand that the criminal has to be treated as a sick man rather than as a wicked one. The whole system of criminal procedure would be changed, and the type now known as the criminal lawyer would in such case disappear. The existing system, under which every prosecuting

<sup>1</sup> This is undoubtedly more true of railroads in the United States than in England, because competing roads have not been tolerated in England to the same extent as in our country.

officer considers his reputation involved in securing the punishment of every accused person brought before the court, necessarily gives rise to a corresponding class of lawyer whose reputation and fee depend upon his opposing the efforts of the prosecuting officer by any means, however unjustifiable.

If now we consider that the large number of men thus liberated by the substitution of Solidarism for our present form of government would not only be employed to diminish the labour of those now engaged in production, but that it constitutes the very part of our population which is engaged in fanning the flame of hatred in the minds of men, the advantage to a community of having this perpetual source of trouble removed will be obvious. But we are concerned, not so much now with the reduction of hatred under the plan of Solidarism, as we are with its economy; we shall therefore next pass to the consideration of the wastefulness involved in the field of production itself, having heretofore considered rather the wastefulness which attends our present system of distribution.

A few years ago horses in the West had become so valueless that they were left unbranded by their owners lest the branding of them involve the payment of taxes thereupon. Cattle, on the other hand, at the same time rose in value; everybody then rushed into the business of raising cattle, with the inevitable result. The price for cattle is to-day so low as greatly to embarrass those who borrowed money to engage in the business, whereas the price of horses has gone up. This state of things furnishes



a very fair opportunity of judging how imperfectly informed the producer is as to the needs of the community. In other words, he is informed that the community is overstocked with an article only by being ruined in the course of producing it. This plan is not only productive of misery to a large number of individuals in every community, but it is necessarily an extremely wasteful one. The object of every community ought to be to produce the things it needs, not the things it does not need. The present system, on the contrary, obliges the community to be continually producing the things it does not need as the only means by which it can arrive at a knowledge of what it does need.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> And yet Herbert Spencer does not hesitate to lavish encomiums on the present system; for example, he says in "A Plea for Liberty," p. 17: "Under our existing voluntary co-operation, with its free contracts and its competition, production and distribution need no official oversight. Demand and supply, and the desire of each man to gain a living by supplying the needs of his fellows spontaneously, evolve that wonderful system whereby a great city has its food daily brought round to all doors or stored at adjacent shops; has clothing for its citizens everywhere at hand in multitudinous varieties; has its houses and furniture and fuel ready-made or stocked in each locality; and has mental pabulum from half-penny papers, hourly hawked around, to weekly shoals of novels and less abundant books of instruction, furnished without stint for small payments. And throughout the kingdom, production as well as distribution is similarly carried on with the smallest amount of superintendence, which proves efficient; while the quantities of the numerous commodities required daily in each locality are adjusted without any other agency than the pursuit of profit."

To him, and to all individualists, the misery caused by the failure to make profit, which attends ninety per cent. of all new business ventures, is a matter of negligible importance.

For under the existing system, over-production occasions a surplusage of things in themselves valuable, but the exchange value of which has been diminished by their abundance. And the producer cannot afford to keep this surplusage, because he has fixed charges to pay. He has to sell his crop at a loss because he must have money to pay rent, or interest on mortgage, or salaries, or for his own support during the year. It is this pressure he is under to sell which impoverishes him. And its consequences are far-reaching; for as the price of raw cotton goes down, cotton manufacturers are encouraged to buy and to increase the output of their factories; and so over-production of raw material tends to result in over-production of manufactured goods.

Were production in the hands of the State, the industry or good harvest of one year would have for effect a diminution of labour the next; or greater comfort or luxury next year for the same labour; no man's labour would be lost, and the bountifulness of Nature would be a blessing, and not, as now, a misfortune.

The efforts to prevent the over-production of cotton in the South gave rise to a convention in 1892, regarding which Professor Ely quotes a telegram from Memphis, January 8, as follows:

"That the farmers of the South are in earnest in their endeavours to solve the serious problem of over-production of cotton is evinced by the enthusiastic meeting of delegates to the convention of the



Mississippi Valley Cotton Growers' Association, which was called to order in this city this morning." <sup>1</sup>

And again, the speech of the President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce:

"In 1890 we harvested a cotton crop of over eight million bales—several hundred thousand bales more than the world could consume. Had the crop of the present year been equally large, it would have been an appalling calamity to the section of our country that devotes so large a portion of its labour and capital to the raising of cotton." <sup>2</sup>

Nothing could better illustrate the evil of our present system and the benefits of Solidarism, than such a state of things as is described by the President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. If, under a system of State production, more bales of cotton were grown in any given year than the community of the world could consume, the State would store away the unused cotton, and would modify its agriculture in a manner to bring the cotton crop into proper relation to the needs of the community. But such an event could not be an "appalling calamity"; it could not be anything but a benefit; so much more wealth for the community; so much less labour for its citizens; and what is true of the cotton crop is equally true of all other crops. Over-production is impossible in a Solidarist community, for all the over-production of one year would mean less work in that particular kind of production

<sup>1</sup> Ely's "Socialism and Social Reform" p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

the next. Every citizen in the community would profit by so-called over-production instead of, as now, suffering from it.

This question of over-production is closely allied to that of invention, which, as is well known, has been a source of despair to working men; for improvements in machinery almost always throw large numbers of them out of employment. In India, as has already been described, the destruction of hand-loom weavers by machinery brought about a misery hardly paralleled in the history of war; "the bones of the cotton-weavers are bleaching the plains of India." And yet invention, far from bringing distress to the working men, as under our system it must, would, under a system of State production, prove an unqualified advantage; for every invention that increases the efficiency of human labour diminishes the amount of time that must be spent in labour in order to obtain the same result. In other words, under a system of State production, the saving of labour is a benefit to every individual in the community, whereas under the competitive system the saving of labour is of immediate benefit to the owner of the patent alone, and means immediate distress to the labourers it throws out of employment.

There is probably no fact in the whole range of Economics more proved beyond the reach of doubt or discussion than that competition is wasteful and costly; the best business men in the country bear witness to it by organising trusts for the single purpose of eliminating competition, and the ex-

perience of all trusts organised upon sound business lines has corroborated the wisdom of those who organised them. Now, if vast economies can be effected by organising combinations of a few industries, how much vaster would be the economy effected if *all* the industries were so combined? For obviously, if similar economies were realised in the production and distribution of meat and bread and all the things that enter into our daily consumption, the diminished cost of supporting those who now produce sugar and steel would make it possible to produce sugar and steel still more cheaply than to-day.

It is probably impossible to do more than guess at the saving in toil and time that would be effected for every man by such a system; suffice it to say that a saving of one-half has been claimed for it, and that this claim is probably not exaggerated.

Solidarism, from the point of view of Economics, is no more than a system for producing and distributing the necessities of life in the most economical manner possible, without putting any one class of citizens at the mercy of another class. To-day the working man is at the mercy of the capitalist; with Government production he would serve the Commonwealth, which he would himself, to the extent of his vote and influence, control. Obviously, those who were found in the course of their education to be fitted for intellectual rather than physical tasks, would be given the work for which they were most fitted; occupation would be determined by natural fitness, and not by the caprice of fortune, and

in this respect Solidarism would be more true to Nature than is our existing system. The physically strong men would be given tasks that needed physical strength, and the intellectually strong would be given tasks that needed intellectual strength. Is not this the plan recommended by intelligence ?

The question, however, remains how the working man is to be paid in the Ideal State.

Justice, according to many authors, demands that men should be awarded according to their utility—in other words, that human institutions should proceed exactly as Nature does ; for Nature begins by committing the injustice of favouring one individual at birth more than another ; and she adds to this injustice throughout the entire life of her favourite ; for the favours granted at birth continue throughout his life so to operate as to sacrifice all others to him. Now, this consequence of natural injustice at birth is exactly what man has attempted to resist ; he has already so far succeeded that those of excelling muscular strength no longer lord it over their fellows ; but there has been substituted for the tyranny of muscular strength the tyranny of that particular form of craft which is skilful in amassing wealth. One tyranny is as bad as, and in some respects worse than the other. The moral rule is not : “ Do unto others according as they are able to do unto you ; ” it is : “ Do unto others according as you would they should do unto you.” Act with others according to their weakness and your own, rather than according to their strength and your own. In other words, diminish for every man the consequence of Nature’s injustice.

If he is sick, nurse him ; if he is weak, strengthen him. This is the order of justice.

But even if this moral rule be set aside as non-existing, if we look only to the question how we can so frame our institutions as to make the whole sum of happiness the greatest possible, it is conceivable that a different economic system might stimulate the altruism<sup>1</sup> that seeks satisfaction mainly through the satisfaction of others. In communities of ants and bees Nature has done it ; and man can do it for himself by suppressing the selfishness that characterises our present competitive system, and is at the same time the direct consequence of it.

One of the worst results of our competitive system is that it rewards men according to their deeds, giving to the few more than they need, and to the many less ; stimulating to effort for the purpose of benefiting self, instead of for the purpose of benefiting the community. The higher order of selfishness, called altruism, has already been realised in the family : a man works for his family because he loves it ; altruism has also been realised, but to a less degree, in the city and the State ; a man will work for his country—nay, will die for it—because he loves it. The next step in altruism is not so impossible as it seems, if once our institutions make it possible. Relieve a man from the necessity of always working for himself, and he will soon acquire

<sup>1</sup> By altruism is meant the seeking of happiness for oneself through the happiness of others as distinguished from selfishness that seeks happiness for self regardless of the happiness of others.

the habit of working for the State, and possibly delight in it.

The only solution of this question of rewards or wages consistent with human happiness and advancement is one in which every man will receive to the utmost possible the same share of the national income, and not one that gives to men according to their deeds ; for this last would stimulate selfishness, and selfishness is the great enemy. Those who propose to admit the stimulus of selfishness into the Ideal State lose the moral point of Solidarism, the main purpose of which is to strike at the root of selfishness. To expose society to the changes involved in Solidarism without removing the stimulus of selfishness, would be to attack the symptom and leave undiminished the disease.

The Spencerian doctrine that justice involves the idea of "inequality of benefits" is consistent with the predatory plan of Nature, but inconsistent with the human ideal which seeks to compensate the unfortunate for the unhappiness to which natural defects expose them. For gifted men are those whom Nature favours ; every gift is a source of happiness ; intelligence furnishes the resource of mental stimulation ; all creative faculty bestows moments of creative rapture ; physical strength contributes to the joy of life. All these things are in themselves sources of happiness. Our present social institutions add wealth to these gifted men, so that they not only enjoy the happiness that flows naturally from their natural gifts, but also the

further happiness that springs from riches. A lawyer enjoys the exercise of his profession; he would not willingly abandon the triumphs of the court-room in order to break stones on the highway. A journalist enjoys the sparkle of his own editorial; the sculptor enjoys the plasticity his art gives to implastic stone. Their occupation is in itself a delight; it ought to be delight enough, and would be delight enough, were necessities and ordinary comfort provided for them. But under our competitive system, success in the struggle for wealth brings to these men wealth also, whereas the ungifted have poverty added to the drudgery of their employment. These are the conditions condemned by Christ in the words: "Unto every man that hath shall be given . . . but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

Were this a necessary condition, it would have to be endured; but Christ has Himself suggested a different ideal—one under which the gifted man shall account to his fellow-creatures for his gifts, and not make of them an instrument of oppression; one under which the ungifted man shall at any rate be assured by the community the same necessities and ordinary comforts as the gifted; and thus—if he may not enjoy the raptures of the creative faculty—he may at any rate be saved from anxiety and want. So only can be realised the social condition proposed by Christ under which "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."



The aim of Solidarism is to substitute love of the neighbour for love of self by framing institutions that make this substitution possible. Nature furnishes us with such institutions in the bee-hive and the ant's nest. These, however, must be modified so as to give to the individual the rights that characterise human justice, and are conspicuous by their absence from animal communities. But the fact that Nature has furnished us a model of Solidarity must not be forgotten in answer to those who contend that Solidarity is impossible because it is contrary to Nature.

Another reason why a Socialism which endeavours to distribute national income according to the utility of the labour of each is not recommended as a solution of our social problem is this: We have laid down the general proposition that if the environment is one which stimulates selfishness, the individual will tend, under the influence of this environment, to become more selfish. Now, if the State continually urges individuals to work for no other motive than that their work result in direct advantage to themselves, they will be working not for the community, but for themselves. The moral purpose of Solidarism, in so far as it attempts to solve the problem of environment, is to substitute for selfish interest an interest in the community which will benefit self only on the condition of benefiting all the other members thereof. That those most gifted by Nature, and therefore able to accomplish their work with the least pain to themselves, are to receive a larger share of the national income than their less



gifted brothers, who are obliged, in order to perform their allotted task, to work longer hours at an occupation possibly less agreeable to themselves, is clearly neither just in principle nor beneficial in result; for such a system would tend to stimulate the very same kind of selfishness as is stimulated by our present system, and as it is the moral purpose of Solidarism to eradicate. If, therefore, the conclusions to which we have come in the preceding pages are at all sound, distribution of national income proportionately to utility of labour would fail to solve the moral problem which we have before us, namely, the problem of how to modify our artificial environment so that instead of stimulating selfishness it will stimulate the reverse of selfishness or altruism.

The system of rewards, therefore, that will best meet what seem to be the moral necessities of the situation, is one under which no individual can gain much save through the gain of all his fellows, the motive of every man being as much as possible to benefit the whole community, and only through the benefit of the whole community benefit himself. In addition, however, to the theoretical argument against dividing income according to deeds derived from the advisableness of diminishing selfishness in the community, there is a practical argument against it which is of no small importance:

Those who oppose Government Ownership very properly point out that if the social income is to be divided according to deeds, the division must be entrusted to the Government; and that the power of determining how much of social income is to be

enjoyed by the various members of a community is a power far greater in extent and far more liable to abuse than any power enjoyed by any civilised government to-day. If the scramble for office, which must always take place, whatever be the economic scheme of society, is to be intensified by the fact that the heads of the Government are not only to enjoy the consideration and authority that pertain to office, but also are to have the power of distributing national income according to deeds, politics would, under such a system, tend to become a field for the basest intrigue and the most remorseless audacity. Such a system would subject the fortune of every individual to the *ipse dixit* of those who had control of the Government. A more arbitrary form of government, or one more likely to result in injustice, cannot well be conceived. It is true that ingenious plans have been devised for determining division according to deeds ; but all of them must necessarily give rise to endless discussion and manifold interpretations, and would have ultimately to be left to the decision of some State official, administrative or judicial. Hence would arise the necessity for a large and expensive judicial organisation, with an elaborate system of courts, juries, lawyers, attorney-generals, and district attorneys ; and indeed, it is probable that the economy resulting from State production would be largely dissipated by the waste of time involved in the determination of how the State income should be divided. In an ideal State all would share the State income in practically equal proportions, subject to a classification that would distinguish between adults

and children, unskilled and highly skilled labour, etc. Such a system would not only be consistent with the highest morality, but would eliminate the almost insoluble problem of how to apportion national income between individuals; and this problem is not only insoluble in itself, but the attempt to solve it would throw into the hands of those to whom the distribution was entrusted a power of which human frailty could not ultimately fail to abuse.

#### F. CONCLUSION

The ideal scheme of Solidarism seems, therefore, to proceed upon the simplest possible plan; it follows Nature closely, for it follows the plan of the ant-hill: Every community undertakes to furnish for the individuals which constitute it a certain amount of food, of comforts, of luxuries, of security, and of pleasure. Wisdom demands that the race be not exhausted or degraded by the process of obtaining these, and Justice demands that the necessity of procuring food be not used by a skilful few as a means for exploiting the many. It is submitted that this demand of justice would be attained were the State to set the citizens at work according to their best abilities, each working for the benefit of the community during the comparatively few hours that would be required to secure necessities and ordinary comforts, all sharing in these necessities and ordinary comforts equally; such a plan would afford a large amount of leisure which every individual could apply to the free pursuit of happiness, whether in the shape of luxury, or art, or literature, or the

satisfaction of individual aspirations. It has been already shown that such a plan would secure the greatest economy of production and the greatest personal liberty; that it would eliminate every occasion of economic injustice, and by diminishing base motives of action to a minimum and relieving humanity from the exhaustion which attends competition, advance the race in body, mind and spirit.

This form of Solidarity furnishes an opportunity for disposing of one objection to it, which is far more popular than well founded. It is a favourite way of disposing of all plans for attaining Justice to say that they are fit only for angels and not fit for men; or, in other words, that so long as men are human, they are not fitted for a Solidarist society. This objection would be founded if, as a matter of fact, the State disregarded the natural and social needs of man; but it is not true of the particular form of State proposed. The principal natural needs of man are food, clothing, comfort, and the satisfaction of his natural affections. These needs belong to that natural part of man which political institutions cannot eliminate. Any political scheme which undertook to ignore these would be false. Far from ignoring these, however, the ideal State would seek to furnish for these needs the highest form of satisfaction; it would recognise that man not only seeks the satisfaction of his physical needs, but also of his moral needs; and that the attempt to satisfy physical without at the same time satisfying moral needs is bound to lead to as much unhappiness as the attempt to satisfy moral needs without regard

to those that are physical. Now the system under which we live makes just this last mistake. It stimulates men to satisfy their physical needs at the cost of cruelty to their neighbour, and in so doing it keeps men not only unjust but unhappy; for the unhappiness which a man occasions in others tends to come back to him ultimately in some form or other.

The Ideal State, on the contrary, would recognise that man has moral as well as physical needs, and would minister to both by making the interest of every man in the satisfaction of his physical needs consistent with the satisfaction of those that are moral also.

The true principle of Solidarity, far from ignoring the natural needs of man, begins, on the contrary, by recognising that every man is, and must always be, engaged in the pursuit of happiness, and proposes to make the pursuit more successful than under the present system. It recognises that men are so bound to one another by common needs and by the advantage of co-operation, that they cannot disregard their natural bonds without pain and degeneration. It proposes to eliminate from the pursuit of happiness to the utmost possible, the bitterness that attends not only struggle and defeat, but, under the competitive system, success also. It proposes to secure to men the satisfaction that results from benefiting others as well as ourselves. It proposes to dignify labour, so that the more menial it be, the more beautiful; for in a Solidarist State it would be rendered not unwillingly upon the compulsion of a sometime odious

master, but willingly as a contribution to the general good.

That such an Ideal State can be realised in this generation is probably impossible ; to many the bare idea seems preposterous ; nor is it proposed in these pages to accomplish in a day a journey that will doubtless take many a long year. There is, however, an essential difference between a movement in the direction of the Ideal State and a journey to a geographical point. It is this: If the point be not reached, the journey is a failure ; whereas, even though we never attain the Ideal State, a programme can be suggested, every step in which will result in a corresponding benefit to the unwealthy ; so that the programme is worth carrying out, if only for the advantage to be gained by every step in it. Socialists, it is true, are opposed to this method ; but it will be explained in a subsequent chapter why this is so, and how the conditions which gave rise to the opposition do not exist in the United States. Indeed, the whole subject of the practicability of efforts in the direction of the Ideal State belong to the next chapter on the Practical Programme. It is referred to here lest the reader be discouraged by what may seem to him to be the unrealisable nature of the Ideal State, and be induced to abandon a study from which he does not see the possibility of practical consequences.

Let him not be discouraged. Let him consider the Practical Programme proposed on its own merits. It will be none the worse for leading, perhaps, eventually to a condition of things more blessed than he can hope for in the wicked world of to-day.

Before passing to the study of the Political Programme, let us pause a moment to reconsider certain words in the Book of Exhortation which we ought now to be better in a position to understand :

It was promised there that a new Power would be revealed to man ; a new Power which had already been secured to man in part by the shedding of blood, and in part unconsciously acquired in the slow development of civilisation. This new Power can now be recognised as the power to mould the environment exercised, or rather exercisable, mainly through the power to vote. For if economic conditions are to be modified so as to substitute collective production by the State for individual production every man for himself, the task can only be accomplished by political action—that is to say, by the exercise of the franchise. How the power to vote can be made the essential instrument through which we can create a new environment that will abolish poverty—the main incentive to crime, and the principal element of injustice in the world, and how this new environment can, by eliminating the necessity for struggle, eliminate also the hatred that attends struggle and all the evil qualities that result therefrom, the attempt will now be made to study and explain.



## CHAPTER III

### THE PRACTICAL PROGRAMME<sup>1</sup>

AN Irish Vestry, desirous of building a new church, is said to have passed the following resolutions: Resolved to build a new church upon the site of the old church. Resolved to occupy the old church until the new church has been built. Resolved to build the new church entirely out of the materials of the old. These resolutions resemble in many respects the platform of those who wish to reconstruct Society economically, politically, socially and morally in a single day. We are all agreed that the whole fabric of our present economic and political system is faulty. We are all agreed that it must be changed. But some of us do not seem to be alive to the fact that by the very necessity of things we must continue to use and live in the present structure during the time that it may take to modify it, and that, under these circumstances, it is not an easy thing to build an entirely new fabric upon the same site as the old.

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is written mainly for American readers, but English political conditions have not been overlooked, and it is believed that the political *principles* laid down here are applicable to England as to America.



Nevertheless, it is not impossible to do so. This very thing was done lately in the city of New York upon Park Place, where the second *Times* building was built upon the same site as the first, without for a day interrupting the publication of the paper therein. But it is hardly necessary to point out that the exclusive use in the new of the material of the old under these circumstances is an idea that could only occur to an Irish vestry. New material must be introduced, and with immense precaution ; the walls must be shored up, and beams introduced below the ground floor to hold up the old building while the larger foundations for the new are being built ; and as every storey is added to the new foundations, new beams have to be introduced to support the upper part of the old building while work is proceeding below. Nor can such a work be successfully undertaken piecemeal. It must follow a preconceived design ; the shoring and under-pinning must precede construction, and must continue to precede it as the work advances ; in other words, the work must follow a given order ; the new building must be begun not where the old most seems to demand restoration, but where it can most economically be undertaken with a view to final result.

It is not more easy (and perhaps not more difficult) to reconstruct a building in which we are ourselves living, than to reconstruct an economic and political system without occasioning more havoc in the process than advantage can in the end be gained. Our economic and political system very much resembles a large house, or rather a large agglomeration of

houses, constructed not according to a preconceived plan, but as occasion has rendered necessary. As our population increases, and we are crowded more and more, the imperfections of this system are more and more forced upon us, and we each of us want the building repaired at the point where the imperfections cause us individually most inconvenience; or if we are influenced by less selfish considerations, we want the building modified according to the imperfection which strikes our imagination as the most intolerable. One family loses a child by typhoid and clamours for new plumbing; others, influenced partly by sympathy for the bereaved, partly by fear for themselves, demand the same thing; but the architect steps in to point out that the fundamental defect resides not so much in the plumbing as in the sewage system; that the sewers were built for one-tenth of the present population, and that unless the sewers are enlarged, no mere repairs of plumbing can remedy the evil; and then the inhabitants divide themselves into two parties: those that demand repairs to plumbing, and those that demand new sewers. Similar are the differences that arise amongst us in regard to political matters: one set, alarmed at the prevalence of infectious diseases, clamours for hygienic measures; another set points out that infectious diseases result from the misery of the poor, and that so long as poverty exists, disease must exist; and thus there are formed two parties in the State: those that want to preserve existing conditions to the utmost and to fight every evil as it presents itself with palliatives; and those that

denounce mere palliatives as ineffectual, and are content with nothing less than radical cure. The wealthy necessarily belong to the Conservative party ; the unwealthy ought to unite in the Radical ; but because the Conservatives have till now been skilful enough to divide and scatter the unwealthy vote, and because the unwealthy have little or no time either to solve political problems or to organise with a view to political action, they have never as yet succeeded in agreeing upon a political platform. This chapter is devoted to a study of the reasons why the unwealthy remain a mere cipher in politics, and of the programme which may be reasonably supposed to be best able by uniting them to give them the control of political affairs which their numbers warrant. Obviously, the parties which to-day appeal most directly to the unwealthy in the United States are the Socialist and Populist parties. But very few people believe in the possibility or advantage of Socialism, and it is claimed that so long as man is as selfish and lazy as he is to-day, he needs the stimulus of self-interest to induce him to work. Socialists can respond that man, like every other animal, is the necessary result of his environment ; he differs from them only in his ability to create his own environment. If he is selfish to-day, it is because he has adopted the competitive system, which constitutes a perpetual stimulus to selfishness : the environment he has created for himself engenders selfishness as automatically and as necessarily as a rotatory press turns out newspapers. Set up a lie

on your press, and every paper it turns out will reproduce that lie ; put a community in an environment in which selfish men alone can survive, and every individual it turns out will be selfish. But the command which man has over his own environment enables him slowly to substitute co-operation for competition, and thus create conditions that will appeal less to the selfish in man and more to his loyalty and affection, so that in the end man will acquire the good qualities that result as necessarily from a good environment as bad qualities result from a bad. Let us cease setting up lies in our printing-press such as that the competitive system is the only system consistent with Nature ; that it is the only scheme of production that is practical ; and let us set up the truth : that the co-operative system is just as consistent with Nature as the competitive ; that it is far more economical, and therefore more practical ; more admirable because more moral ; then every paper that we turn out will reproduce this truth ; every child we educate will bear the imprint of it ; every man brought up to work for the Commonwealth instead of for himself will embody it ; and the conversion of our present selfish industrial system into an unselfish co-operative Commonwealth, which to-day seems impossible, may turn out to be a necessary and even unavoidable result.

This is the Socialists' contention ; but workers need not to-day concern themselves with the solution of the question ; suffice it for us that every time co-operation is substituted for competition, appeal is made to the virtue in man instead

of to the vice in him, and without considering now how far this process can eventually be carried, let us get to work to effect this substitution as fast as the community can stand it.

And first, let us agree upon the undoubted fact that the answer to the question how fast the community can effect the change, must differ with every community; for clearly our own country is better prepared for such a substitution than Abyssinia or Afghanistan. We shall endeavour, then, to decide how best to set to work at this task for English-speaking people and no other.

Next, let us agree as to what exactly is meant by the substitution of co-operation for competition. It has already been more than once pointed out that co-operative workshops, though admirable schools for training working men in the art of business, of government, and of self-control, are exposed themselves to competition with other shops, and thereby stimulate the very cupidity and acquisitiveness which it is the aim of Solidarism to discourage. In other words, they either fail and tend to discourage, or they prosper and tend to degenerate.

Socialists claim that co-operation can be effectually substituted for competition only through the intervention of a truly democratic State. It has been already pointed out that no true democracy has ever existed, because, under the competitive system, the most industrious citizens have not the time to devote to their political duties; they are driven to follow the lead of professional politicians who are in politics purely for their own advance-

ment; it is only when Government becomes so bad, or the evil becomes so great as to be intolerable, that the citizens wake up and organise committees and associations in order to suppress the evil: Witness the spasmodic efforts at so-called Reform in American machine governed cities and similar ineffectual agitation on the subject of unemployment in England at regularly recurring periods of industrial depression.<sup>1</sup> If, however, a community, by undertaking the business of production, were to effect economies that would leave to every citizen a large margin of leisure, these citizens would not only have the time, but would also have an added incentive to devote the necessary attention to politics; for Government would then play so large a part in the comfort of all its citizens that the fitness of the men to whom the management of Government enterprises was entrusted would become to every citizen a matter of vital, indeed of principal importance. When the cheapness of rent, gas, trams, coal, meat, bread, and in fact, most of the necessities of life, depend upon the skill of the Government officials at the head of the departments engaged in producing them, every citizen will find it to his interest to devote the necessary time to securing that unfit men be removed and replaced by men who are fit.

These are, according to the Socialists, the only

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that the present Unemployed Bill may wipe away the reproach of having so long neglected so vital a measure. But up to the present time the agitation has, in view of the magnitude of the evil, displayed the lamentable inadequacy of Parliament as a Representative body.



conditions under which Government can be safely entrusted with the production and distribution of necessities; and to say that because it would be folly to entrust our *present* Government with this task, we can never get a Government to whom such a task could be confided, would be like saying that because before railroads were invented there did not exist a corps of engineers capable of managing railroads, therefore there never would exist such a body of men. The kind of man is produced by the conditions that demand it; and just as Railroad Companies find capable overseers to-day, so the Government of to-morrow will find capable officials; for then the citizens will have a sufficient interest in the result to take the trouble to exact it.

It is indeed claimed by Socialists that no truly democratic State can ever come into existence except through the extension of State industries to a point at which every citizen will co-operate with all the other citizens in the economical production and distribution of the things they severally need. In proportion as the industries are owned and worked by the State, competition will be eliminated, and the economies of co-operation secured; there will be no longer the necessity of earning profits; the necessity of effecting sales; the necessity of lowering wages; the necessity of securing foreign markets. All these necessities will come to an end; for the State will, through its practically unlimited resources, be sufficiently mistress of the situation to store away produce in excess, to wait until demand adjusts itself to supply, to find other occupation for those

thrown out of employment by over-production in any one industry, and to exchange excess of produce for the excess of other nations when advantageous, but only when advantageous. In a word, the State—the Commonwealth—is mistress where its individual citizens are slaves, as indeed a Trade Union is often in a position to dictate rates of wages where the isolated working man has to submit to the iron law of supply and demand.

Not that competition need be wholly eliminated ; on the contrary, it would probably constitute a salutary check to official perfunctoriness, provided it were confined within proper limits. For example, inasmuch as the State would require from the citizen only one-half of his time for the production of necessities, the individual would have the rest of his day to devote to any occupation which interested him. Those interested in artistic pursuits would devote their leisure to art ; others would devote it to literature ; others to music ; others, again, to industrial enterprise, or to the production of luxuries, or even to the production of necessities, should the State not produce these necessities to their satisfaction. Nor would every citizen be necessarily compelled to work for the State. All those capable of earning a maintenance outside of State industry might be left free to do so.

The principal reason for substituting co-operation for competition, as regards the production of necessities, is that so long as the production of necessities is left to private enterprise, it is necessarily controlled by capitalists ; and workers can get necessities only on



the condition of working for wages paid by the employer. But there result from the relation of employee to employer two evils fatal to the happiness of the community: In the first place, the relation creates animosity, which mars the goodwill that ought to exist between members of the same community. In the second place, it necessarily creates injustice; both employer and employee are under this system the slaves of the Market, and driven by it into perpetual conflict one with another.

Now, whether Socialists be right or not, there are obviously two essential things which workers have an immediate interest in obtaining if they can:

First, Security from starvation or the almshouse.

Second, Security that they will have a fair share of the product of their toil.

Take the production of *necessaries* out of the hands of the capitalist, who is concerned only with making profit; put it into the hands of the State, which is concerned only with satisfying the legitimate needs of the citizen; and it is claimed that both these essential things have been secured. Let the citizen, by working for the State a certain number of hours in the day during the working years of his life, be assured his share in the total income of the State, and then let competition during the remaining hours of the day keep the State up to the mark.<sup>1</sup> Here is the limit within which competition seems to

<sup>1</sup> This is not orthodox Socialism; but it is the form of Socialism which seems to recommend itself as the least unattainable at this present time.

be a good thing. Beyond this limit, it has been shown to be bad.

But even though this contention of Socialists be theoretically sound, the primary question remains how rapidly, if at all, this change can be effected.

It has already been pointed out that those countries have enjoyed most liberty which have been contented to earn liberty by slow degrees. If a man who finds himself upon a precipitous hillside one hundred yards above the place to which he desires to repair, were to proceed to get there by a single jump, the consequences would be disastrous; or, if he were to attempt to get there in twenty jumps of five yards each, he would be maimed long before he got to the bottom. If, on the other hand, instead of sacrificing everything to rapidity of achievement, he wound a way down the side of the hill by steps that would lower him no more than a few inches at every effort, he would undoubtedly take longer to reach the lower level, but he would at any rate preserve the soundness of his limbs in the process.

All history goes to show that in this respect political progress proceeds upon the same principle. Revolution not only upsets the whole political system, as does too rapid a descent, but it creates a reaction which tends to unfit the system for further advance. It is not difficult to understand that Government, whether that of the city, of the State, or of the entire nation, could not be safely entrusted with the control of the distribution of all the necessaries of life in a single day without pro-

ducing a confusion that would tend to discredit the experiment. Whereas, if Government Ownership were to be extended by sufficiently slow degrees, not only the Government, but the people, will gradually become accustomed to the change, and it will produce neither failure on the part of the Government nor discontent on the part of the governed.

Again, it must be borne in mind that in effecting changes of this sort, the welfare of the whole community must be considered, including those whom this change would throw out of employment. Some of those whom such changes throw out of employment are likely to be useful in carrying out the enterprise ; if, therefore, in the nationalisation of our railroads, the Government were so to effect the process as to ruin or estrange all those now engaged in the railroad business, the task of the Government in taking over the management of the railroads would be infinitely increased thereby. Whereas, if on the contrary, the process were effected in such a manner as to keep in Government employment those most skilled, and therefore most useful in railroad management, the task of the Government would be facilitated, and the comfort of the whole people correspondingly secured.

Last, though not least, the fact should always be borne in mind that the most wicked result of the competitive system is the hatred that it engenders between man and man. It is not easy for workers to feel kindly towards employers whom they have been accustomed to regard as selfish and tyrannical, but these pages will have been written in vain if they

have not succeeded in persuading workers that the conditions under which employers live deprive them of the happiness at which we all equally aim. The very struggle to which the employer is put, not only with other employers, but with his own employees, creates for him an environment of which he is the principal victim. If workers look beyond the conditions under which they suffer, and beyond the men at whose hands they seem to suffer, to the merciless Market which exposes both employer and employee alike to similar, though not identical evils, they will cease to regard the employer, in spite of his selfishness, with animosity, and will be in a position to consider how far the State that takes over an industry may not reap advantage by dealing fairly with the employer as well as with the employee.

This question can be considered from two points of view, the business point of view and the moral. From the business point of view, it must be remembered that business is built on credit; any act of spoliation would shake the very foundation of our economic system in a manner that might for many years dangerously affect the interests of the unwealthy by temporarily throwing out of employment thousands—nay, millions of working men, and producing the very confusion which it is most desirable to avoid.

Nor can we afford to ignore the moral point of view. From the moral point of view, the objects to be attained by change are peace and happiness. Violence never produced these. If we are animated by the spirit of peace and fairness, the whole

movement in the direction of increased Solidarity can be effected, not only without violence, but even without wide-spread dissatisfaction; while on the other hand, if the movement is taken up by a faction, merely for the purpose of transferring property from one group of citizens to another, the result can hardly be other than disastrous — nay, possibly fatal, to the whole community.

What, then, are the two virtues we have to practise if we want to attain the largest possible political result in the least possible time? We have to exercise consideration and patience. Consideration, for hatred destroys, co-operation constructs; and patience, for Time sanctions only what Time has prepared.

If, therefore, the ultimate object to be attained is the gradual substitution of co-operation for competition by the substitution of the State for the individual in the production and distribution of the necessities of life, and if this substitution is going to be effected by slow degrees, what are the first steps to be taken in this direction?

This question brings us to the title of this chapter: What is to be the Practical Programme? And it divides itself into three subordinate questions:

1. What is to be the character of the movement, Economic or Political?
2. By whom is the movement to be effected, by machinery already in existence, or by machinery constructed to that end?
3. What is to be the Programme itself?

In answer to the first of these questions, it cannot be too often repeated that Trade Unions, however useful, however indispensable they are to the improvement of the condition of the worker, can never, under the existing competitive system, accomplish more than raise wages within the limits fixed by the Market—can never put an end to the competitive system which is the cause of our subjection. Upon this point the experience of English workers is conclusive. When English Trade Unions sought to push their claims at a moment when this limit had been reached they were disastrously beaten. Beyond this limit they are powerless—nay, they are worse than powerless, for the result of effort pushed beyond this limit is to injure the industry upon which they depend. The business England lost during the lock out of 1897 America and Germany permanently gained.

But upon the political field there is no such limit fixed; the vote of every worker counts as much as that of a millionaire; the worker has, by virtue of his vote, as much to say about Government as his employer; upon the political field the battle is equal—nay, the odds are on the side of the unwealthy, for they outnumber the wealthy a hundred to one. If, then, there be a political remedy for the ills of the worker, is it not a pity that the worker has not long since applied it?

There are obvious reasons why he has not done so. In the first place, the political remedy has not been made clear to him; but the better reason is, that he has never been organised *to this end*. Workers are either organised in the Trade Union or they are not

organised at all ; and the Trade Union has in America so far wisely abstained from politics, lest through the dissensions of Democrats and Republicans it become divided against itself. It had a first indispensable work to do—raise wages ; this had to be accomplished first, for this was a matter of daily bread. But much has happened of late to permit of a new departure. Wages have been raised almost as high as they can under the competitive system reach ; there is no longer any vital issue between Republicans and Democrats in America, nor between Liberals and Conservatives in England. Protection or Free Trade is a matter of policy, not of principle ; one may be good for one country and bad for the rest ; the other may be wise one day and unwise the day after ; indeed it is probable that parties are now kept in existence by their leaders, mainly with a view to power and to spoils. There is only one vital issue left—the issue between Mass and Class—the issue between Co-operation and Competition. This is the one thing about which it is any longer worth fighting, and as regards this thing, the wage-earners can no longer be disunited. Whether they belong to a Trade Union or not, they must see—and if they do not, we must help them to see—that co-operation means in the end freedom—the greatest freedom at all possible upon this earth.

One consideration, however, must not be lost sight of : The wage-earners, though they outnumber capitalists, probably do not constitute a majority of the voters in the country. The farmers in America, who ought to be on our side, are an uncertain quantity,



have never studied these questions, and being scattered over the country, are difficult to educate, and almost impossible to organise. The small tradesmen, however poor, because they belong to the trading class, have the trader's instincts, and are probably, for the most part, on the side of capital. So also are the parasitic classes, such as lawyers, commercial travellers, clerks, and all who depend directly on capital for their daily bread. It is the opposition of these that constitutes a large part of the difficulty in the way of political action, and it is this opposition that we must in a measure break down. How this can be done will be considered in answer to the last question proposed. Suffice it here to point out that it is the difficulty of converting this contingent that has doubtless prevented workers from entering the political arena. And yet their fears are ungrounded; the waste and injustice of the competitive system have already become clear to some members of every class. There is a moral sense in the community upon which we can in the end count; even in the ranks of idle capitalists are already to be found avowed Socialists. There is no room for discouragement here; we ought eventually to get all the wage-earners on our side, and we can count on the most formidable of all allies—Truth. The limit of our success is the limit of our own courage, perseverance and faith. If these are what the justice of our cause demands and justifies, no power on earth can stand against them.

By whom, then, is the movement to be carried on?  
By the wage-earners.



“Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.”

Tradesmen may fear and resent the Trusts; farmers may fear and resent the Railroads; but they have independent lives of their own; they directly depend on no one for their support; the one own their own stock-in-trade; the others<sup>1</sup> own their own farms and tools; the indignation aroused in them by Trust and Railroad is fitful; they survive, or think they can survive, in spite of them. It is the wage-earner alone who is without machinery, without property, and without a house save the temporary lodging that the work he happens to be doing determines for him. It is upon him that the evil consequences of every depression first falls; it is by lowering his wages that the manufacturer seeks to meet low prices; it is by throwing him out of employment that over-production ceases and remunerative prices are restored.

It is the wage-earners, then, who are primarily interested in finding a Political Programme that will eventually rescue them from their present bondage. When, however, we come to study statistics with a view to deciding whether the wage-earners are numerically strong enough to carry a Political Programme alone, we are struck by the disappointing fact that in the first place, the American census is so prepared as to make it impossible to state with precision just what the numerical strength of the wage-earners is.

<sup>1</sup> This is true only of the American farmer; the position of the English farmer is more complicated.

In the second place, we cannot hope to bring *all* wage-earners under one banner. Trade Unions have not succeeded in doing it; and if it has proved impossible to get even a majority of American wage-earners to unite in order to secure the immediate advantage of high wages, how much more difficult will it be to unite them in order to secure the remoter advantages of political reform! A thousand considerations will prevent our natural allies from joining us. Habit first and foremost will do this; the habit of voting with the Republican or Democratic party; the senseless boast that expresses itself in the words, "I am a Democrat;" long affiliation with party leaders; a notion that loyalty to party will one day bring some reward; a fear that so-called party disloyalty will one day involve some punishment; all these things operate together or individually to prevent wage-earners from abandoning the party to which they regard themselves as belonging in order to join a new organisation, even though organised with a special view to promoting their particular interests. The comparatively small vote cast for the Socialist and Populist parties at the last Presidential election sufficiently illustrates this fact.

It is probable, therefore, that although the wage-earners are those who should initiate the movement, the movement, in order to be successful, ought not to be confined to the wage-earners, but ought to include other groups of the Mass.

It has been already stated that the farmers ought to be on our side, but that because they for the most

part own their own farms, they take an attitude towards the great issue that is essentially capitalistic. The same thing is true of small tradesmen, and yet an effort will be made in this chapter to demonstrate the possibility of framing a Practical Programme, which, without compromising any of the principles involved in the issue between Mass and Class, will nevertheless be of a character not to alienate, and even to attract the important elements in a voting population represented by the farmer and the tradesmen; and if we can do this, we shall have in the possibility of securing the alliance of the farmer and the tradesman, a further reason why the issue between Mass and Class should be fought out upon the political rather than on the economic field; and in order that this important question be clearly understood and discussed, let us now consider just what is meant by the question whether the battle of the unwealthy against the wealthy can best be fought out on economic or on political grounds.

The Trade Union is an effort to fight capital on the economic field—that is to say, the question involved in the organisation of Trade Unions is a purely economic question, the question of wages. Workmen at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when guilds had disappeared and the factory had come into existence, discovered that so long as they were unorganised and competing with one another for employment, the employer could reduce wages almost to the starvation point. With a view to eliminating competition between working men, and to presenting

a united front against the capitalists, working men organised Trade Unions, but this organisation was purely economic—that is to say, it was purely for the purpose of raising wages; it was in no sense political. Indeed, the primary maxim of all Trade Union organisation is that it must be independent of politics, for the excellent reason that if politics were once admitted into the Trade Union organisation, they must necessarily weaken it; obviously, if the organisation became Republican, the effect of being Republican would eliminate Democrats, and if it became Democratic, the fact of its being Democratic would eliminate Republicans. For this reason Trade Unions have, until quite lately in England, been essentially non-political and purely economic in their nature. This is what is meant by saying that heretofore the battle between workers and capitalists has been purely economic.

Reasons have been given in the previous pages for believing that Trade Unions upon the economic field can never do more than advance wages up to a point determined by the Market, and that if Trade Unions seek to advance wages beyond that point, they injure the industry upon which they depend for their very existence. Too much emphasis cannot be laid upon this important point, for upon it depends the whole question whether working men are to confine themselves to action in their Trade Unions, or whether, on the contrary, they are to join issue with capital on the field of politics.

After this explanation, it will be more readily understood why the political field is a more advan-

tageous ground for the struggle between Mass and Class than the economic. In the first place, numbers do not count on the economic ground ; on the contrary, the larger the number of workers in every industry, the weaker are they on the economic field ; for the very fact that an industry can only occupy a certain number of workmen keeps a large number of workmen outside of the Trade Union organisation ; and wherever a Trade Union finds its numbers larger than the industry can support, the less efficient workers become a burden upon those who are more efficient. Upon the economic field, therefore, numbers tend to cripple the worker in his fight against capital. On the political field, on the contrary, the larger the number of the workers, the stronger they are, for on the political field, every wage-earner has his vote, and the vote of every wage-earner counts as much as that of every capitalist. Moreover, if it be true that the wage-earner cannot depend upon securing the co-operation of all the rest of the wage-earners in the political fight, he can, if he frame his political programme intelligently, secure the alliance of the farmer and the small tradesman. In other words, the fight is no longer between the wage-earner and the capitalist, but between the larger class of the unwealthy and the wealthy.

We find ourselves here, therefore, answering the second of the two questions proposed—that is to say, by whom the movement is to be effected, and in a position to pass to the second part of the second question—that is to say, whether it is to be effected

by machinery already in existence or by machinery constructed to that end.

The work of organising a new party is always a difficult and laborious one. If we look back to the origin of the Republican party, we will find its beginnings far back in the forties when the moral sense of the community, aided by the difference between economic conditions in the North and the South, began to find expression in the protests of the Abolitionists. When we consider the justice of their cause, not only from the moral but the economic standpoint, we cannot but be surprised at the time which elapsed before the Abolitionists were able to organise into a party strong enough in the first place to nominate a candidate for the presidency, and in the second place to elect him. Indeed, had not the Abolitionists been favoured by the gradual break up of the Whig party, it is impossible to state how much longer slavery would have continued to demoralise our community.

So far as the justice of our cause is concerned, both upon the economic and the moral question, we occupy very much the position to-day which the Abolitionists occupied in the forties. But we have perhaps passed through the period of mere protest. We have indeed at various times taken up political issues and almost vindicated them at the polls. It is unnecessary to discuss here how far the political issues raised by the Populist and by the Democratic parties in 1896 and in 1900 constituted a wise or practical programme; but there is no doubt that underlying the political issues raised, there was the sentiment of the



injustice and economic defects of existing conditions, and the fact that over six and a half million votes were cast for Bryan in 1896 ought to encourage us in beginning to-day to lay down the lines of a new political organisation that will eventually do for the Democratic party what the Free Soilers did for the Whigs. In other words, the Free Soilers, in nominating Fremont for the presidency in 1856, knew that they represented at that election a lost cause; but strong in the justice of their claim, they undertook the arduous labour necessary to create a new organisation, convinced that in the end there was in the American people sufficient intelligence and morality eventually to rally a majority to the polls.

Now it is possible that if the unwealthy were to agree upon a Practical Programme, they could secure control of the Democratic party at the next presidential election; but in order to do this, it is indispensable for those who believe in pushing the conflict between Mass and Class into the political field, to organise at once with a view either to capturing the Democratic party in 1908, or to nominating their own candidate if the Democratic party remains in the hands of those who nominated Parker last year.

In other words, whether we may hope ultimately to capture the Democratic party, or whether to capture the Democratic party be impossible, our immediate duty is to organise.

One of the old Christian fathers said that there were three cardinal Christian virtues: The first was humility, the second was humility, and the

third was humility. So also may it be said that there are three essentials to political action: The first is organisation, the second is organisation, and the third is organisation.

The organisation of a political party upon a Practical Programme to take up the whole fight between Mass and Class, irrespective of the difference of opinions that now exist between the Populists and the Socialists, and with a view to bringing both to vote for the same candidate at the polls, is not as arduous as it may at first seem; for when we come to discuss a Practical Programme we shall find that it not only includes national issues but also local and municipal issues, and that although the great battle must inevitably be fought every four years in the presidential election, every State, every city, every town, and every village in the country furnishes us at once with an opportunity for organisation, with a view to carrying out that part of our programme which concerns purely local government. Indeed, it may be said that unconsciously the battle has already begun; in other words, the obvious economic advantage of certain features in our programme have forced themselves upon the attention of business men to such an extent that in the most Conservative of all popular governments—England, the programme of Public Ownership has perhaps been already developed to the greatest degree.

All that we have to do, therefore, is to organise, with a view to completing a programme already admitted to be sound, a task which will turn out



not to be so difficult as that which confronted the Abolitionists sixty years ago.

We are now in a position to discuss the programme itself.

It may be said as a general rule that the discontented poor approve of all movements directed against the rich. The difference, however, between a practical programme and an impractical programme is that the one will secure on election day a majority at the polls, and that the other will not. This is the whole problem of practical politics. It is quite useless for a cause to be just or to be economically sound, or even to be expedient, if it cannot bring a majority of voters to the poll on election day.

It is perfectly possible for a measure to be just, expedient, and economically sound, and yet not to be within what Gladstone called "the sphere of practical politics," for the simple reason that a majority of the electors may not yet have had their attention sufficiently directed to the issue to have recognised its justice, or its economic soundness, or its expediency.

It is true that one of the ways of calling the attention of the electors to the justice, economic soundness, or expediency of a measure is to organise a party to that end; but so long as men and women, not content to sow a harvest for posterity to reap, are satisfied only if they see a chance of reaping some part of the harvest themselves, so long it will be precarious to attempt to organise a political party for the purpose of introducing a reform, the

realisation of which must be so remote as not to be possible within a lifetime.

This is the practical difficulty which presents itself to the Socialist programme. We cannot too much admire the courage, perseverance and faith which characterises those who devote their lives to the propaganda of Socialism, and if all our fellow-citizens were endowed with enough imagination to appreciate the blessings that would result from the realisation of a Socialist programme, and had the patience to wait during the long period necessary for the radical changes such a programme involves, the efforts of the Socialists would undoubtedly be one day crowned with success. But whether the Socialists are right or wrong, it is an undoubted fact that the realisation of their programme seems so remote that it tends to alienate the hard-headed Anglo-Saxon who has a very undeserved contempt for the things he cannot himself comprehend.

Moreover, the attempt to introduce immediately a Socialist form of government would probably be highly inexpedient, because it could hardly unite a majority, would alienate those willing to vote for a less drastic measure, and tend to discredit the group proposing it.

The same may be said of other measures which may be in themselves just; let us consider by way of illustration the wisdom of the silver issue; and let us begin, for the purposes of this illustration, by assuming the truth of the contention that the law of 1873 which demonetised silver was a nefarious law, inasmuch as it increased the burden of the

debtor to the advantage of the capitalistic class.

If we study the question solely from the point of view of practical politics—that is to say, the point of view as to whether the issue was likely or not likely to bring a majority of voters to the polls, it would seem as though we should be driven to the conclusion that it was not a practical measure; and the reason of this is obvious. The measure would have benefited the whole debtor class—that is to say, the farmer who had borrowed gold when it was cheap and was required to pay it when it was dear; but the wage-earner is not a debtor; on the contrary, he belongs rather to the creditor class, for every week he advances his labour to the capitalist, and is paid only after his labour has been rendered. Moreover, while cheap labour would have cheapened the money which the farmer owed in the shape of a mortgage on his farm, it would also have cheapened the wages which the working man received at the end of every week for his labour. It is not likely that the working man's wages would have been doubled to correspond with the decreased purchasing power of his wages. A worker who earned \$2 a day prior to the election of Bryan, would have probably continued to earn \$2 a day long after Bryan's election to the presidency. Meanwhile, however, money having diminished in value, the purchasing power of his wages would have diminished, and the \$2 would have been able to buy only one-half of what it had bought under the capitalistic régime. In other words, what the farmer gained, the wage-earner would have lost. The

capitalist took care that the wage-earner, in the Eastern States, at any rate, learnt this lesson, and it was the fact that the wage-earner learnt this lesson in the Eastern States that undoubtedly beat Bryan at the polls. A measure, therefore, which was just in so far as it tended to restore money to the value of what it was before 1873, was inexpedient, because it divided the ranks of those upon whose votes we must learn to count.

Another illustration of an issue, which, although expedient in itself, may nevertheless contribute to divide the unwealthy, is to be found in the so-called English Trade Disputes Bill. The Taff Vale decision for the first time declared the funds of Trade Unions responsible in damages for injuries committed as the result of strikes, black lists, etc. Subsequent decisions have rendered the law so contradictory and confusing that "no Union official can say what is legal and what is not, or when he is risking his Union's funds, and when his own property."<sup>1</sup>

These decisions threaten the very existence of Trade Unions, for if the funds they collect out of the daily sacrifices of their members are at the mercy of Courts notably friendly to employers, they can be ultimately impoverished and deprived of resources vital to their existence. Obviously, then, working men have a paramount interest in the passage of a bill that will protect them from so dangerous a possibility. Nevertheless, in spite of the majority in favour of the Bill, it is prob-

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Circular of the Labour Representation Committee, No. 1, June, 1902.

able that the present Parliament has no intention to pass it, and as the issue is one in which unorganised labour and small tradesmen are not interested—indeed, both are likely to take the employers' view of the question—it is extremely unlikely that this issue alone will command a majority in the country. It does not seem, therefore, to be an issue which will unite a majority at the polls. It is a good *Trade Union* issue, but it is not a good *party* issue.

It seems, then, as though we should have to distinguish between measures which, however excellent in themselves, are not such as are likely to unite a majority at the polls on election day, and measures which, though not perhaps of the greatest urgency, have the inestimable advantage that they estrange no important factor of the unwealthy voters, and can therefore be defined as Programme measures.

There is one other quality which measures must have in order to constitute Programme measures: they must be expedient—that is to say, they must be such that the enforcement of them will not give rise to more evil than advantage. It sometimes happens that there exists in the community a sufficiently large number of persons so violently opposed to a measure in itself just, as to render its enforcement not only impossible, but productive of the worst form of political evil. Experience seems to show that such is the case with the law that obliges liquor and beer saloons to close on Sundays in the city of New York. Doubtless the law itself is promoted by a religious and laudable desire to make of Sunday a day of wholesome rest, and in so far as it prevents the day from being

desecrated by the debauchery of the criminal classes, it is a good thing. Unfortunately, there exists in New York City a large body of Germans whose habits have made social gathering in a beer garden the natural and comfortable way of spending the only day of rest they have in seven, and the strong opposition that comes from this class of the community, backed by the legitimate demands of the working man for the use of the saloon which constitutes the only club he has, creates a public opinion against the enforcement of this law of which Tammany avails itself at the expense of the liquor dealers in order to secure re-election every time that a reform administration endeavours to enforce the law. The experience of both Mayor Strong and Mayor Low sufficiently illustrates this principle.

It seems, therefore, as though we might complete our rule as follows: It does not suffice for a political measure to be just and economically sound in order to constitute a Programme measure; it must also be expedient, and it must be such as to unite a majority of voters at the polls.

Having studied what measures it would probably be unwise to insert in a Practical Programme, and having laid down some of the principles which seem to determine the general character of measures which should form part of a Practical Programme, let us now consider what are the measures most likely to unite the unwealthy in concerted political action—most likely to advance their interests to the greatest degree practicable, and to constitute the first effectual step towards the substitution of co-opera-

tion for competition in our economic and political institutions.

Of all the popular measures that are now before the public, none is so likely to satisfy all the requirements that have been heretofore indicated as essential to a Practical Programme as the nationalisation of national industries and the municipalisation of municipal industries.

From every point of view, the purchase by the Government of railroads and telegraph systems is to be recommended. It is time that the colossal fortunes made in the management of railroads by private individuals cease to increase; it is time that the profits derivable from the exploitation of railroads enure to the public; it is time that railroad rates be reduced and adjusted so that the farmer can bring to market his produce without paying most if not all his profit to railroad kings.

Government Ownership of railroads in Australia and Belgium ought to suffice without further comment to justify this measure. In both these countries rates have been reduced and the railroads have been run in the interest of the public instead of in the interest of a few individuals. In Australia Government Ownership of railroads permits the farmer to sell his produce to the Government at his door, the Government undertaking to transport, market and sell the same, and to account to the farmer for any balance obtained over the price paid at the door.

Not only, then, is Government Ownership of railroads to-day economically sound, but it is also



politically acceptable. There is no important factor of the unwealthy that will be opposed to it. The only objection that can be made to making Government Ownership the principal plank of our platform is that it does not seem to confer an immediate benefit on wage-earners, and if indeed the idea of public ownership were confined to railroads and telegraphs, this objection would undoubtedly be to a large extent true.

But Government Ownership of railroads and telegraphs should eventually be extended to the ownership of trusts, and the same organisation of the unwealthy which votes Government Ownership can be trusted also to vote a proper remuneration to the wage-earners employed in the railroads and in all the industries eventually taken over by the State.

How far it may be wise to embody so large a programme in our political platform is doubtful. The majority of voters are perhaps indisposed to undertake too extensive and too radical changes at once, and it would be a part of the duty of our organisation to determine by close contact with the unwealthy voter, the extent to which it would be wise to extend the limits of Government Ownership. But of the many branches of industry the ownership of which it is important for the Government to secure, none is so urgent as the railroads, because they constitute a natural monopoly; we none of us can dispense with the use of railroads; if we want to move either ourselves or our goods from place to place, the use of railroads is practically forced upon us, and we generally have no choice as between one railroad and another, except between a few great

railroad centres. We have to pay the rates imposed upon us by the railroad we must use. The suggestion to solve the railroad problem by subjecting rates to Federal control will not settle the question; on the contrary it will aggravate it; for it will force Railroad Kings to use their millions to secure favourable rates either by corrupting the officials whose business it is to determine rates, or by controlling the political party that appoints them.

Again, Government Ownership of railroads is a measure which will secure the vote of the farmer. Wage-earners will not, therefore, be confined to the votes of the wage-earners in the support of such a measure, but will, on the contrary, secure the alliance of that large and unorganised group of electors capable of contributing a determining number of votes at the polls on the day of election.

It is probable, therefore, that no one measure is likely to unite so large a body of the unwealthy into common action in the United States as the single platform of the Government Ownership of railroads, and for this reason it is probably around this one idea that it would be most easy to form a powerful political organisation.<sup>1</sup>

It ought to satisfy both the ultra-practical men and the ultra-ideal men, for the former would not find in such a programme any of the things that to-day discredit for them the programme of the

<sup>1</sup> Although national ownership of railroads is not as important a matter in England as in America, the Labour Representation Committee has recognised the idea as forming part of their programme. See their leaflet, No. 12, "Why our Railways should be Nationalised."

Socialist ; whereas the Socialists or the ideal men would have to recognise that Government Ownership of railroads is a long step in the direction of that larger Government Ownership which is their aim.

It is true that the Socialists have heretofore refused to vote for a partial programme. They contend that to vote for Government Ownership to-day would be only to enlarge the powers of the present capitalistic class, for inasmuch as the capitalist class to-day control the Government, by putting the Government into control of the railroads we should only be changing one master for another ; and the Socialists are undoubtedly right in this contention, provided the measure were proposed by the capitalists and voted by the capitalists ; but if we of the proletariat organise a party sufficiently powerful to elect a president upon the platform of Government Ownership, we shall at the same time be sufficiently powerful to elect a congress pledged to our principles ; and with a congress, as well as a president elected by us, it is we who would be in control of the railroads and not the capitalistic class.

For this reason, although there would doubtless remain a large number of uncompromising Socialists outside of our ranks, it is reasonable to suppose that even though the Socialists maintain their separate organisation, a large part of them would on election day vote for our platform.

It seems, therefore, as though Government Ownership of railroads constituted a measure which satisfied all the requisites which have been found essential to a Practical Programme. The measure is in itself just,

it is economically sound, it is expedient. It will not disunite the unwealthy, but on the contrary, ought to secure the vote of a large majority at the polls.

Last, but not least, it is a step in the direction of that substitution of co-operation for competition which it is the obvious interest of all members of the community, rich and poor, to consummate, could they only see things as they really are, and not as each, from his individual point of view, tends to misregard them.

Although the Government Ownership of railroads is probably the most direct step to urge as a national issue, it must be considered only as a first step—that is to say, it must be considered as only a part of the general programme, looking to national ownership of national industries.

The next great step to be taken will be to secure national ownership of the great industrial trusts, and it is one of the merits of the general idea of nationalising national industries and municipalising municipal industries that while the battle in favour of the one—that is to say, in favour of the nationalisation of national industries can be fought only once in every four years, the battle in favour of the municipalisation of municipal industries can be fought every hour of every day, and brought to the polls in some cities every twelve months, and in others every two years. In other words, while a national organisation should be undertaking to organise, with a view to securing Government Ownership of national industries, the same organisation ought to be through local branches pushing the

programme to the utmost in every city, town and village in the nation, the details of the programme differing in every place with the conditions existing in that place; for example, in one city the most burning issue is likely to be that of public lighting; in other places, where the lighting is already done by the city, the issue is likely to be public ownership of tramways; in other towns, where waterworks are still in the hands of private individuals, the issue will be the public ownership of waterworks; and ultimately we may secure the co-operation of tradesmen also by urging municipal ownership of department stores under conditions that would prevent department stores from competing as they do now with the small retailer.

It is probably neither wise nor necessary to enter at this time into a detailed working out of a plan for converting private into public ownership. The exact conditions under which this should be done must depend in every case upon local conditions. Only one thing need be insisted upon: the conversion from private to public ownership should be conducted in such a manner as not to deserve the name of spoliation. The State can afford to be generous; it can afford to take over private industries in such a manner as to secure the co-operation of those most skilled in the industries taken over—indeed, the compensation which the Government ought to give to private owners could probably take the shape, first of the issue of bonds to represent the fair value of the industry taken over, and second, of an annuity or salary to those whose experience it

may be wise to retain in the employment of the State.

It cannot be too often urged that there is between the policy proposed in these pages and the policy proposed by Karl Marx an immense difference. Karl Marx could see salvation for the working man only in an increasing hostility between employer and employee, a hostility which would end by becoming so disastrous to the employee that he would be driven by it to revolt and revolution. Hatred seemed to Marx to be the moving force that would lead eventually to emancipation, and his teachings remain the fundamental doctrine of the orthodox Socialists of to-day. During the half century which has elapsed since Marx wrote his great work on capital, events have not altogether justified his prophecy. There is not more hatred in the ranks of the employees now than then, but there is far more intelligence, far more information, and far more experience. They are able to-day to look beyond the apparent tyranny of the employer to the real tyranny of the market. They are able to-day to understand that there is between every fellow-citizen—even between employer and employee—a bond that neither can afford to disregard, and that any attack made upon the capitalist as a class may injure the very industry upon which employees depend for livelihood. Witness the lockout of the British Engineers in 1897.

It is far more in the interests of workers to adjust their differences with employers through the agency of political action by the silent and peaceful vote

than by expensive resort to strikes or barbarous resort to violence, and all members of the community will lead happier lives by uniting, in so far as union is at all possible, with a view to solving our economic and political problems with the least injury to one another possible.

There are violent men in every community who will prefer violent measures :

“My sentence is for open war ; of wiles more inexpert I boast not.”

But if this century is to be better than the last, it is because men are learning that violence is the method of the brute, forbearance and counsel the apanage of man.

For the benefit of those who have not any detailed knowledge as to what has already been accomplished in the direction of the extension of municipal ownership, it may be well to refer briefly to what has been accomplished in one at least of the cities in Europe.

There is nothing new, startling, or revolutionary about the proposition to extend the functions of a city or State. The cities of Germany and England have during the last fifty years had no new object but that of the business interests of their citizens and the extension of the sphere of their activity. Let us take Glasgow as illustration of how advantageously municipal ownership can be and has been extended.



GLASGOW <sup>1</sup>

Glasgow illustrates the undoubted fact that the growth of cities need not be unconscious as that of organic life, but may be deliberate and conscious, partaking of the nature of human construction rather than of organic development.

The history of Glasgow has been summed up in the words: "Glasgow made the Clyde, and the Clyde made Glasgow." In the early part of the eighteenth century Glasgow was not a seaport, for the Clyde was not a navigable river. In 1755 the magistrates began to study the question how far the interests of Glasgow could be advanced by improving the navigation of the Clyde, which at that time consisted of a wide shoal only two feet deep at Dumbuck Ford and at Hirst Ford, and at the Harbour of Glasgow only fourteen inches at low tide, and only three feet three inches of water at high tide.

The city of Glasgow, by deepening the Clyde, has become one of the most important ports of Great Britain, and the first ship-building centre in the world. From the year 1770 to the 30th of June, 1896, there has been spent on the navigation of the Clyde from Port Glasgow to Glasgow Bridge, and on the harbour of Glasgow, £15,810,000. The city enjoys, as income on the expenditure, £404,500 a year. In 1770 the population of Glasgow was a little over 30,000; it is now over 900,000.

This story is too eloquent to need any comment,

<sup>1</sup> The facts contained in the following are mostly taken from the work entitled, "Glasgow, its Municipal Organisation and Administration," by Sir James Bell, Lord Provost of Glasgow.

and presents a startling contrast to the action of the New York municipal authorities in connection with New York Harbour. Nature has done everything for New York, which probably presents the finest natural harbour in the world, but the needs of modern shipping require a deeper channel than New York to-day possesses. The cost of such a channel would be small by the side of that spent by the city of Glasgow. Yet our municipal authorities have not even taken the idea of this channel into consideration. They left it to the initiative of private citizens to secure from the Federal Government occasional appropriations for deepening the harbour with a view to improving private property. Even when the North German Lloyd announced that they were constructing vessels of twenty-eight and thirty feet draught which, by reason of the shallowness of the water over Sandy Hook Bar, would compel them to abandon the port of New York, the municipal authorities took no step to improve its harbour. It was entirely due to private initiative that the representatives of all the steamship lines were united in the effort to secure the relief from the Federal Government which the municipal authorities neglected to afford. And the progress of the work under Federal control has been so slow that New York shipping cannot be yet said to be safe from the dangers resulting from Government inadequacy.

Glasgow furnishes a startling contrast to New York.

The same spirit that deepened the Clyde is expressed in all the City Departments. For example,

the problem of the disposal of domestic refuse has been handled without timidity. The refuse is sorted, and that part of it which is marketable is sold, and that part which, though possessing some value as manure, does not possess enough to permit its sale, is moved to farms purchased by the city for this purpose at Fullwood Moss, Ryding and Maryburg. The soil of one of them is boggy, the soil of the others is poor and clayey. The dumping of this unsaleable city refuse on these farms has so improved the land that it actually now produces income. Fullwood produces about £207 a year, and disposes of 23,000 tons of unsaleable refuse. Ryding yields an average annual profit of £518, and disposes of over 30,000 tons of refuse yearly.

New York is surrounded by salt meadows which at the present time produce nothing but the mosquitoes that serve to torment and poison us. Nothing would be easier than, by purchasing these meadows and applying thereto the labour of our almshouses and penitentiaries, to convert this waste and pernicious land into remunerative farms, thereby dealing at once not only with the problem of the refuse of our kitchens, but also with the much more important problem of the refuse of our population.

To this question of the refuse of our population, Glasgow has devoted considerable attention, proceeding upon the obvious principle that crime and pauperism were fostered by unsanitary habitations. Glasgow secured the power in 1866, by the so-called "City Improvement Act," to buy up some of the worst areas, with a view to destroying the overcrowded

and unwholesome buildings upon them and laying out proper streets throughout. They began with an area of 88 acres, which contained a population of 51,000 persons, and borrowed £1,250,000 to improve the same, and in spite of incomplete powers, which they were obliged to supplement by a new Act of Parliament, slowly put up buildings that are a credit to the city.

Struck by the fact that no persons in the working class are more entitled to sympathy than the man or woman who is left a widower or widow with a family of children, the city has built lodging-houses for their benefit. Each room is plainly furnished, heated with hot water, and lighted with electricity. The children are taken charge of during the day; those of them who are of school age are sent to school, and those under it are taken care of in the home, where a *crèche*, a general recreation-room, and a cooking and dining-room are all provided, all these things being paid for by the tenant at about cost price.

The city was aware that it had no right to destroy tenements on the one hand without providing for the population on the other. It therefore built lodging-houses, some for men and others for women, each lodger having a separate cubicle in a spacious dormitory, a wooden partition seven feet high separating each, and a comfortable bed, with daily aired and weekly changed bed-clothes. Each lodger has the use of a kitchen, provided with a hot plate, cooking utensils and dishes, and from a shop within the establishment he can buy such

uncooked food as he wishes. A commodious dining-hall is at his disposal, and in each building there is an ample and airy day-hall and recreation-room. There are also bath and lavatory accommodation, and conveniences for washing and drying clothes, and all this for the payment of from six to nine cents a day.

The New York tenement houses present a worse condition than ever did those of Glasgow, for in the east side the population is admittedly the densest in the world.

Yet our municipal authorities have not undertaken to deal with this question, but have left it to private enterprise; and although individuals have done much to improve conditions by building model tenement houses, the position of the poor has been rendered worse rather than better by the State legislature, for the exactions of the tenement house law have had for principal effect to raise rents, a result which can hardly be regarded as altogether satisfactory by those who find it at times impossible to pay rent at all.

The plain duty of the City of New York is to expropriate the unsanitary blocks, and do for them what Glasgow did.

It must not be imagined that the municipal action of Glasgow is to be attributed to a Socialistic spirit in the municipal body. On the contrary, no accusation would be more strongly resented by the municipal authorities of Glasgow than the charge of Socialism. Indeed, the work which first brought into prominent political life the man who lately stood as the pillar

of the Conservative party in England was the doing for Birmingham slums what Glasgow did for hers. The honour of having done this is due to Joseph Chamberlain, and yet the proposition that New York should undertake such work would be denounced by the typical New York citizen as communistic and an encroachment upon the sacred right of private property.

It is hardly necessary to say that Glasgow owns its own water supply. It used to be furnished with bad water by private companies, but the private companies were replaced by the municipal authorities. Water is now provided from Loch Katrine, which probably furnishes Glasgow with the purest water in the world, and private water companies have gone out of existence. The old rates charged by private companies were roughly about 1s. per pound of rental. Under the municipal ownership the rates have been reduced to just one-half—that is to say, 6d. per pound of rental, and nevertheless, the water department produces a considerable net revenue in the city.

Gas, of course, was first furnished to Glasgow by private companies, and they charged prices which ranged from 5s. (that is to say, about one dollar) to 5s 2d. per thousand cubic feet, and smaller rates to those who consumed larger amounts—that is, to the employers and the rich. Glasgow bought out the old companies, and now furnishes gas at 2s. 2d. per thousand feet—that is to say, at about fifty cents. This is done without any expense to the city.

The city also owns an electrical plant which

furnishes light to both the city and private consumers at practically cost rates.

Glasgow not only owns its own tramways, but works its own tramways. It has largely reduced the rates, so that the average ride in a Glasgow tram costs two cents, and the shorter ones as low as one cent. During the first year of its working, 1896, the city nevertheless netted a profit of about £83,267—that is to say, over 400,000 dollars.<sup>1</sup>

Gas is used largely in Glasgow for purely heating purposes. Indeed, since gas has become cheap, working men use it so much for cooking that cooking stoves are furnished at cost price by the city. The city authorities are aware that a great economy could be made in the manufacture of gas for heating purposes. Gas has to be rendered fit for lighting purposes by the addition of carbon, which almost doubles the price. If gas could be made solely for heating purposes, it could be furnished at about one-half the price of illuminating gas. The Glasgow authorities have this in mind, but the manufacture of gas for heating purposes alone would involve the laying down of a complete set of new pipes and a new set of works.

<sup>1</sup> Almost all the large cities in England are far in advance of our own in the acquisition of city industries. A report made by our consul at Hull closes as follows :

“The working profit on account of the street cars for the year was \$185,238, from which \$48,329 is to be deducted for interest on loans, and \$45,700 for sinking-fund instalments, and \$37,400 to be transferred to the reserve fund, making the credit balance for this year \$57,500.

“In each instance, then, with the exception of the crematory and the baths, the municipalisation of public utilities in Hull has resulted in a profit to the City Treasury. The profit, it is



This is a very costly outlay, and inasmuch as it is probable that eventually light will be furnished exclusively by electricity, it is expected that the present pipes will serve exclusively for the supply of gas for heating purposes, which will then be furnished at about one-half of the present price.

New York has so many different sets of gas mains, owing to the number of gas companies which at one time competed, but are now combined in a single consolidation, that it would be a small expense to devote one set of mains to heating gas, and it could probably then be furnished at twenty-five to thirty cents a thousand feet.

It would be an interesting thing for an American working man to calculate how much he spends for gas, coal and tramways. Dividing this figure by two would represent to him the economy he would make if these things were furnished by the city instead of by private corporations.

Now this economy is not an unattainable thing. It is actually within our grasp if we will only take the trouble to hold out our hands for it—to agree true, is small, but it must be remembered that the charges for these public services are extremely low.

“A ride on the street cars in any direction to the end of the line costs only two cents; an exclusive telephone service in a private house costs less than \$25 a year, and in a business office about \$30 a year. Gas is sold at forty-eight cents per thousand feet, and electricity at nine cents per unit.

“The object is not so much to make a profit for the city out of these utilities as to furnish the public with the best service at the lowest possible price. Viewed in this light, municipalisation in Hull can be pronounced a success.”—*New York Times*, Dec. 10, 1904.

with one another to demand and secure it. There are two obstacles in our way, to which attention has already been incidentally drawn, and to which now we must devote a special section.

#### OBSTACLES TO POLITICAL ORGANISATION

There are two great groups of workers to whom the arguments contained in this book ought to appeal—the Socialists and the Trade Unions—and yet it is from these very groups that obstacles to political organisation along the lines suggested are likely to arise. We have to consider why this is so, and how far these obstacles can be overcome.

Those who are responsible for the success and survival of Trade Unions are perhaps alone aware of the perpetual vigilance necessary to keep them alive. Beneficial and indeed indispensable as they are to the maintenance of wages, they have not succeeded in securing the allegiance of more than an insignificant minority of the wage-earners in the United States; the large majority of them remain outside of the Unions, benefiting by their labours without sharing in their sacrifices. The main weapon of the Union is the Strike, and occasionally this weapon has to be used. Now, the Strike is a weapon which is often as dangerous to those that use it as to those against whom it is directed; for every strike puts the loyalty of Union members to the severest strain.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Quarterly Bulletin of the New York State Department of Labour, published in July, 1905, says:

“The failure of the strike on the rapid transit system in New

Under these circumstances, it is obvious that no leader could keep his Union together unless he were tireless in preaching loyalty to the Union as the cardinal virtue of the wage-earner. He must set the Union above every earthly consideration; it must be the one thought around which every action of his life revolves, and upon which the whole energy of his body and mind is concentrated.

Now, one of the dangers to which every Union is exposed is the intrusion and dividing tendency of politics; it is therefore a cardinal maxim of Union faith that politics must be rigorously excluded from the debates and decisions of the Union. For this reason not only the leaders, but the rank and file of the Unions, have contracted the habit of putting political action on a plane below Union action. This is so much a part of their way of thinking that they turn instinctively away from any suggestion to consider the wisdom of political organisation. "If we go into politics we are lost!" This is the answer that will be made us; this is the formula behind which Trade Unionists entrench themselves and become unamenable to argument.

We must not allow ourselves to be deterred by this. There is between the politics of the Republican and Democratic parties and the politics of Solidarity as little likeness as between a huntsman and his prey. The Republican and Democratic parties want the York resulted in the disruption of Unions embracing a membership of more than 4,000; that of the glaziers was followed by the dissolution of a Union of 500 men, while the disputes in the Fulton County glove manufacture also caused very large losses."

vote of the worker in the interest of their *machines* respectively. A party of Solidarity wants the votes of the worker in the interest of the *worker*. The objection will be made that the men who start political organisation cannot in the very nature of things be trusted; they will be working in their own interests, either with a view to self-aggrandisement, or with the intention to "sell out" to one of the parties. The last of these suspicions, though often expressed, is not worthy of serious consideration; political clubs are doubtless organised to this end; but the votes of workers, bent on advancing their own interests, cannot be delivered as are the votes of a club deliberately organised for a corrupt purpose. The suspicion that those who start political organisations are likely to be actuated by ambition is more founded; but there is a kind of man in whom we cannot do better than instil such ambition; there is good ambition and bad; the willingness to do labour and sacrifice in a good cause is a good ambition, and the more we have of it amongst us the better. Ambition, however, that merely looks to possible political office is a bad ambition, and can to a great degree be eliminated by a single device: Let it be an essential clause of the proposed political constitution that those who organise the party or run the organisation be not eligible to office, and selfish ambition will be eliminated from our leaders, and unselfish ambition alone remain; the former being the desire to secure consideration regardless of the interests of others, and the latter being the desire to secure consideration through the advancement of the interests of others.

Let it be clearly insisted on, over and over again, that because our politics belong to the unselfish kind, they are not to be put in the same class with the politics which we have allowed to dominate us until to-day. Let us take this saving weapon of politics out of the hands of the machine, and through it secure for ourselves the rights which belong to us, and which we have only to organise in order to secure.

At this juncture it may not be inexpedient to refer briefly to the late political organisation of the Trade Unions in England, not only as a lesson but as a warning. It will serve usefully as both.

In 1899 the Trade Union Congress decided to call a meeting of the Trade Unions and of the Socialist Societies for the purpose of organising political Labour Representation. The meeting was held in London in February, 1900, and was attended by the representatives of sixty-seven Trade Unions, and of three Socialist Societies: the Independent Labour Party, the Social-Democratic Federation and the Fabian Society. John Burns and other Labour representatives in Parliament were also present. At this meeting was organised the Labour Representation Committee, which is still in operation in very much the same form in which it was originally started, except that the Social-Democratic Federation, which sets up for being the orthodox Socialistic organisation of Great Britain, has withdrawn.

The Labour Representation Committee was at once confronted with the problem how it was to behave in

the presence of the two great parties: the Liberals and the Conservatives, the membership of the Unions forming the Committee being divided between the two. Without entering into the discussion of this question, which has persisted ever since its organisation, the Committee has to-day decided to organise an independent party, and to affiliate with neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives. They have now four members in Parliament, and expect at the next election to contest about fifty seats. They are in possession of a fund which, though small, permits of their entering the lists to this extent.

The experience of England seems to indicate that an Independent Labour Party is not an impossible thing, and that it is not inconsistent with Trade Union interests to undertake the organisation of such a party. But invaluable though be English experience as a lesson, it should also serve as a pregnant warning: The party organised by the Trade Unions, though it has associated with it two other bodies, the Independent Labour Party and the Fabian Society—the latter, at least, of which is composed of persons not exclusively committed to Trade Union interests—is nevertheless so dominated by Trade Union bias that the policy of the Independent Party just come into existence is practically controlled by it. We have but to read the report of its meetings in order to appreciate that the only measures that seem to be seriously entertained and discussed by the Committee are measures that primarily interest Trade Unions, as for example, the Trade Disputes Bill, as to the expediency of which,



as a Programme measure, doubt has already been expressed.<sup>1</sup> The other questions which have secured the attention of the Committee are the Working Men's Compensation Act, the question of Chinese Labour, the question of Unemployment. Needless to say that all these questions are of immense, immediate interest to the prosperity of the working man, but they are not measures which can induce all the unwealthy voters, whether they belong to a Trade Union or not, whether they are wage-earners or tradesmen or clerks, to abandon the party to which they by long habit and tradition belong, and constitute a phalanx that can be counted upon to bring a majority to the polls on election day. The Committee, being composed mainly of Trade Union men, has not yet sufficiently studied the economic and political questions examined in the foregoing pages to recognise that the real enemy, the real master, the real tyrant is the Market, and that it is the competitive system that creates the Market, and that it is to the destruction of the competitive system that all their efforts should be directed. How little they appreciate this may be gathered from the fact that a Resolution recognising Government Ownership to be the ultimate object of the party was received with laughter and passed without debate as too innocuous to deserve the attention of an adverse vote (*Kritische Blätter für die gesamten Sozialwissenschaften*, Report of the Fifth Annual Conference of the Labour Representation Committee, p. 145).

There is but one remedy for this in England:

<sup>1</sup> See p. 188.



education. Eventually the possible failure of the efforts of this Independent Party to secure majorities at the polls upon issues that interest only organised labour, may direct their attention to the fundamental issues upon which alone an unwealthy majority can be certainly secured.

Meanwhile let us in the United States learn a lesson from England. Let working men be organised with the support of the Trade Unions, but not by the Trade Unions. Let the organisation be large enough to include those who do not belong to Trade Unions, as well as those that do—the tradesman, the farmer, the clerk, and all in fact who belong to the real majority that ought to rule the State in the interest of the majority, but as a matter of fact are to-day ruled in the State by a contemptible minority in the interest of that minority and to the sacrifice of all the rest.

The Socialist objection to our programme is this: They claim that so long as Government is in the hands of the Capitalists, we should only be increasing the power of the Capitalists by handing monopolies over into their hands; that in individual hands, industry is scattered, and the power that belongs to industrial control to some extent dissipated; whereas, if we were to put these industries in the hands of the Government, the Capitalists who control the Government would enjoy a concentrated power that would be by so much greater than it is already, and render the political struggle by so much the more unequal.

That this contention is true in Germany, where Socialism had its origin and where it is best

organised, no one can reasonably doubt. The most superficial knowledge, for example, of the methods adopted by the German Government in the administration of its present monopolies, such as railroads and mines, is sufficient to explain the refusal of German Socialists to vote for any measure that will increase the scope of Government influence. The policy of the German Socialists is therefore to wait until they have the majority and then introduce their entire programme.

No one can deny the wisdom of this policy, and indeed it differs in no respect from the one suggested in this book. For there is between conditions in America and Germany a radical difference: In the first place, the Germans are more Idealist than ourselves; they more readily adopt a programme that to the practical American or Englishman seems utopian and unattainable; the Socialist party is yearly receiving such additions to its ranks that the day when it will control the Government is almost in sight.

But in the second place, the nationalisation of public utilities is not an issue which could to-day secure in Germany a majority of the unwealthy at the polls. *The railroads are already for the most part owned by the State*; it is the Conservative element that has voted for Municipal Ownership in the past, and would vote for an extension of it to-morrow. In the United States, on the contrary, the railroads and most of the great municipal monopolies are owned by *individuals* who control the Government and will not consent to their

purchase by the State. In other words, we have here in America an issue which can at once rally all of our inclining into one great party, and this party will not only vote for Government Ownership, but secure the management of the Government after Government Ownership is secured. This is the essential difference between us and our German comrades. They must wait patiently until they can secure a majority for their entire programme. We can at once secure a majority for the first and most important step in it, and with that same majority administer the Government in the interests of all our fellow-citizens instead of leaving it as now to be administered in the interests of a favoured few.

Shall we American workers then be any longer deterred from taking this work in hand?

Shall we not say to the Socialists:

Leave German reasons to Germany; they are pointless here; take here at once what you can get of your programme, and do not refuse a large slice because you cannot have the whole loaf.

Shall we not say to the Trade Unions:

Continue your work on the Economic field, but do not for that reason refuse to join us in the political; you have done the infinitely harder part of the work, for you have organised where your very numbers told against you; help us now to organise where our numbers will count in our favour; where organisation can put you in control not only of one industry, but of all industry; where it can secure not a mere advance in

wages, but that just part in the product of our labour which is the workers' due.

Shall we not say to the employer :

It is time for you to rest; you have worked too hard; you have earned an *otium cum dignitate*; hand over your burden to the State; cease harassing yourself and others about profit, and take from the Nation your share of national production; is it not large enough for all? For if you think it is not, you will discover that it is.

Shall we not say to one another :

At last we know our enemy; it is not capital; it is not our employer; it is not the sweater; it is the Market, and that which makes the Market—competition. Let us compete only in well-doing; let us at last co-operate, not in a single workshop for a narrow purpose of individual wage, but along the whole horizon of national industry, upon the broad lines of political organisation, and for the broad purpose of universal welfare, that at last may be fulfilled the prophecy of Christ: "I will give unto this last even as unto thee."

Book III

WISDOM—FAITH—KARITAS



## WISDOM

HAVE you awakened, oh, my brothers ?

Having ears, do you at last hear ; and having eyes, do you at last see ?

Or, having read the Book of Knowledge, are your counsels still dark ?

For think not by mere knowledge to become wise.

It has been said : " Knowledge comes, but Wisdom lingers ; "

For Knowledge is of the mind, and Wisdom is of the heart ;

Knowledge is of the thought, and Wisdom is of the will ;

Through Knowledge we partake indeed of manhood, but through Wisdom we can become Gods.

We can get Knowledge through the reading of books, but Wisdom we can get only through the power of the will ; and the power of the will is the greatest of all the powers ; it is the power of Faith that removes mountains ; it is the power that overcomes evil ; and that alone can subdue Nature.

And this power can become ours if we have both Knowledge and Faith ; it can never be ours if we have only knowledge without faith.

What, then, is Faith ?



## FAITH

There is much evil in man ; so much evil that the man of Knowledge despairs, but the man of Wisdom hopes.

The man of mere knowledge says : " Man is selfish by nature ; he seeks happiness everyone for himself ; so long as man is selfish and seeks happiness everyone for himself there must be strife ; and strife breeds hate, and hate breeds unhappiness.

" Man, too, is a creature of habit ; he has acquired habits of selfishness ; he cannot get rid of them ; they are the law of his nature. Man cannot overcome a Law of Nature."

To these, Wisdom answers : " Nay, the lower animals are indeed creatures of habit and the slaves thereof ; but the apurage of man is the power to get rid of habit—or to replace bad habit by good. So, too, selfishness is the mark of the beast in man ; but there is in man also the power to overcome selfishness, or to replace selfishness by unselfishness."

" There is no unselfishness possible to man," answers the man of Knowledge, " for man has needs that are stronger than he is ; the need of happiness, of procreation, of shelter, of food. Man must satisfy these needs or he must die. The effort man makes to satisfy his needs is selfishness ; it cannot be otherwise.

" In truth," answers Wisdom, " every man must satisfy his needs or die ; has a right, indeed, to

happiness also, for man has been given the power to attain happiness. But there are two ways to seek happiness—one *regardless of the happiness of others* ; one *through the happiness of others*.

"The first is the way of the selfish, who seek eagerly but never find.

"The second is the way of the unselfish, who do not seek and yet find."

But the man of Knowledge shakes his head mournfully, and answers: "This is the Gospel that has been preached to man for thousands of years, and does not man nevertheless still continue to seek happiness every man for himself?"

Rouse ye, oh, my brothers! rouse ye from the gloom of those who despair, and learn to distinguish Wisdom from Knowledge.

True, indeed, is it that for thousands of years man has listened to the gospel of peace, and continued to follow the counsel of war, but do we not now know why?

Is not man the creature of his own environment?

And if he has made for himself an environment of strife and hatred, must he not indeed strive and hate?

And if he can make for himself an environment of solidarity and goodwill, may he not at last cease to strive, and cease also to hate?

The man of Knowledge will shake his head and despair; but oh, my brothers! so long as hope is still left to us, shall we not hope?

Are the words of the man of Knowledge so proved beyond doubt, that there is indeed no room for hope?

Are the words of Wisdom not as worthy of belief as his ?

And Wisdom offers us happiness, while the man of Knowledge offers us only despair.

Of the two, which will you take ?

Nay, let us believe the words of Wisdom and Hope; let even those of us who doubt say: "We shall be better, we shall be happier for believing the words of Wisdom; and we shall make those around us better and happier by believing them."

Let us out of the words of Wisdom build our articles of faith.

Let us silence discouragement by an act of will.

To believe that of which we are convinced is no merit; but to believe that of which we are not convinced, because by so believing we can make those about us happy, is merit; and the belief that man is capable of improvement is the first step towards improvement.

To believe that man is capable of improvement, though we be tempted to believe he is not, is an act of Faith.

In the name of the God that remains obscure in heaven, and in the name of the God that stands revealed in ourselves, let us believe that we have the power to improve. Let this be our Faith, and it will become our Salvation.

The power to believe that which we are inclined to disbelieve is a part of the power to do what we are inclined not to do, and is part of the power to refrain

from doing what we are tempted to do. It is the power of the will.

The lower animals have no will. They must do that which they are inclined to do ; they cannot do otherwise.

Man *can* do otherwise. This is the doctrine called the Freedom of the Will.

The man of Knowledge shakes his head and says : "The will of man is not free ; he must act according to his greater inclination. If he seems to act sometimes otherwise than according to his greater inclination, it is because his greater inclination is other than it seems. A man must follow his inclination as certainly as a stone rolls downhill.

"But what," answers Wisdom, "if the stone could change the hill—convert the downhill into a level?"

The man of Knowledge smiles : "It is foolishness."

"Nay," answers Wisdom, "it is foolishness to say that a stone can do this. But man is not a stone ; indeed, he can become a god, for he can make his own environment. He can replace an environment of strife and hatred by one of peace and goodwill. Then, by your own rule man, being bound to follow his inclination, will cease to act according to hate and strife, and on the contrary, act according to peace and goodwill. And so, although man must indeed follow his inclination, he is master of his inclination, because *if he wills* he can by his control of Environment make his own inclination."

"Well you say *if he wills*," answers the man of Knowledge, "for man has for thousands of years proven that he does not so will ; he pursues pleasure

alone, and as pleasure still flies he still pursues. It has ever been so, and will be so to the end."

Rouse ye, oh, my brothers! rouse ye from the gloom of those who despair, and learn to distinguish Wisdom from Knowledge.

True is it that for thousands of years men have been seeking pleasure and not finding it, but during those thousands of years men have been either exploiting or exploited by one another; either masters or slaves; either sick of leisure or sick of work; every man's hand against every man; each seeking pleasure or escaping pain, regardless of the pleasure or pain of those around him. How could he then heed a gospel that can be practised only by men who are helping one another, ministering to one another, comforting one another?

Put men in a fiery furnace and bid them be cool, or naked in the Arctic storm and bid them be warm; throw a crust into a starving crowd, and chide it for scrambling; set them fighting for their lives, and bid them love one another.

Nay, rather rescue them from the furnace, protect them from the storm, give them sufficient food, assure them protection for life and limb, and behold! as the environment changes so will man change; when he *need* no longer fight, then will he no longer fight; when he *need* no longer hate, then will he no longer hate; when he may heed the gospel of peace, then will he indeed heed it, for it is the way of happiness.

Listen, oh, my brothers! for here is the secret of the

New Gospel ; here is the key to the new life ; THE FREEDOM OF MAN'S WILL IS THE FREEDOM TO MAKE HIS OWN ENVIRONMENT ; the power of God in man is the power to regenerate man by regenerating the conditions that surround him ; to make him unselfish by changing the conditions that make him selfish ; to bring peace into the world by destroying the occasions of war.

This is the power that men have unto this day obscurely called Faith, because it is Divine in its conception and Divine in its efficiency ; because without it Knowledge is vain, and with it Knowledge performs miracles ; because through it, and through it alone, man can subdue Nature.

## KARITAS

But there is yet a third thing that must be added unto you to make your work complete ; a third thing of which St. Paul said : "Though I speak with the tongues of angels and have it not I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal ; and though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge ; and though I have all faith and have it not I am nothing." Of which he said that "it suffereth long and is kind ; envieth not ; vaunteth not itself ; is not puffed up ; doth not behave itself unseemly ; seeketh not its own ; is not easily provoked ; thinketh no evil ; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in truth ; believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

And this third thing St. Paul called KARITAS. Karitas has ceased to exist amongst us ; the very

name of it has passed away, or been perverted in its use.

It is not charity—for charity is alms-giving—and alms-giving has been doled out to the poor with so unfeeling a hand that we say of winter: "It is cold as charity."

It is not love—for love of the flesh is lust; love of the flesh is the breeder of jealousy and strife; out of too much loving comes too much hate.

Let us call it, then, as St. Paul called it—*Karitas*; for it lasted in St. Paul's day only a few years—only as long as men and women followed indeed the doctrines of Christ. But when they followed new gods, and worshipped at the altar of Antichrist, *Karitas* faded away; it can come again only when casting aside the pomp of the world, we seek once more true happiness in the Gospel of Peace.

Then will come the day of which St. Paul prophesied: "Now we see through a glass darkly, but when that which is perfect has come shall we see face to face."

There, indeed, abide Knowledge, Faith and *Karitas*; but the greatest of these is *Karitas*.

For Knowledge is as the soil out of which there spring good and bad.

And Faith is as the Gardener who prepares the soil, sows the seed, separates the good plants from the bad, destroys the bad and tends the good.

But *Karitas* is the bud and the blossom and the fruit; the best that the soil can produce, and the Gardener's reward.



Oh, my brothers, let Faith in us till the soil of Knowledge that we may reap the harvest—Karitas.

For the reign of Karitas is the reign of mutual aid ; and it is through mutual aid alone that man can attain happiness, freedom and self-respect.

There is a nascent Godhead in every man ; this nascent Godhead has been all these years crushed by the tyranny of a debasing Environment.

We can change the Environment ; we can, by modifying economic conditions, destroy all in it that is base.

We can dispel darkness and admit light.

We can open our hearts and lungs to the air.

Shall we continue to stifle in factory prisons, or shall we decide to breathe the air of heaven ?

Shall we continue to tolerate an Environment that keeps us slaves, or shall we create an Environment that will make us gods ?

THE END



# SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES.

SCARLET CLOTH, EACH 2s. 6d.

1. **Work and Wages.** Prof. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.  
"Nothing that Professor Rogers writes can fail to be of interest to thoughtful people."—*Athenæum*.
2. **Civilisation: its Cause and Cure.** EDWARD CARPENTER.  
"No passing piece of polemics, but a permanent possession."—*Scottish Review*.
3. **Quintessence of Socialism.** Dr. SCHÄFFLE. ✓  
"Precisely the manual needed. Brief, lucid, fair and wise."—*British Weekly*.
4. **Darwinism and Politics.** D. G. RITCHIE, M.A. (Oxon.).  
New Edition, with two additional Essays on HUMAN EVOLUTION.  
"One of the most suggestive books we have met with."—*Literary World*.
5. **Religion of Socialism.** E. BELFORT BAX. ~~W~~
6. **Ethics of Socialism.** E. BELFORT BAX.  
"Mr. Bax is by far the ablest of the English exponents of Socialism."—*Westminster Review*.
7. **The Drink Question.** Dr. KATE MITCHELL.  
"Plenty of interesting matter for reflection."—*Graphic*.
8. **Promotion of General Happiness.** Prof. M. MACMILLAN.  
"A reasoned account of the most advanced and most enlightened utilitarian doctrine in a clear and readable form."—*Scotsman*.
9. **England's Ideal, &c.** EDWARD CARPENTER.  
"The literary power is unmistakable, their freshness of style, their humour, and their enthusiasm."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
10. **Socialism in England.** SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B. ✓  
"The best general view of the subject from the modern Socialist side."—*Athenæum*.
11. **Prince Bismarck and State Socialism.** W. H. DAWSON.  
"A succinct, well-digested review of German social and economic legislation since 1870."—*Saturday Review*.
12. **Godwin's Political Justice (On Property).** Edited by H. S. SALT.  
"Shows Godwin at his best; with an interesting and informing introduction."—*Glasgow Herald*.
13. **The Story of the French Revolution.** E. BELFORT BAX.  
"A trustworthy outline."—*Scotsman*.
14. **The Co-Operative Commonwealth.** LAURENCE GRONLUND.  
"An independent exposition of the Socialism of the Marx school."—*Contemporary Review*.
15. **Essays and Addresses.** BERNARD BOSANQUET, M.A. (Oxon.).  
"Ought to be in the hands of every student of the Nineteenth Century spirit."—*Echo*.  
"No one can complain of not being able to understand what Mr. Bosanquet means."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
16. **Charity Organisation.** C. S. LOCH, Secretary to Charity Organisation Society.  
"A perfect little manual."—*Athenæum*.  
"Deserves a wide circulation."—*Scotsman*.
17. **Thoreau's Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers.** Edited by H. S. SALT.  
"An interesting collection of essays."—*Literary World*.
18. **Self-Help a Hundred Years Ago.** G. J. HOLYOAKE.  
"Will be studied with much benefit by all who are interested in the amelioration of the condition of the poor."—*Morning Post*.
19. **The New York State Reformatory at Elmira.** ALEXANDER WINTER.  
With Preface by HAVELOCK ELLIS.  
"A valuable contribution to the literature of penology."—*Black and White*.
20. **Common Sense about Women.** T. W. HIGGINSON.  
"An admirable collection of papers, advocating in the most liberal spirit the emancipation of women."—*Woman's Herald*.
21. **The Unearned Increment.** W. H. DAWSON. ~~W~~  
"A concise but comprehensive volume."—*Echo*.
22. **Our Destiny.** LAURENCE GRONLUND.  
"A very vigorous little book, dealing with the influence of Socialism on morals and religion."—*Daily Chronicle*.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(Continued).

23. **The Working-Class Movement in America.** Dr. EDWARD and E. MARX AVELING.  
 "Will give a good idea of the condition of the working classes in America, and of the various organisations which they have formed."—*Scots Leader*.
24. **Luxury.** Prof. EMILE DE LAVELEYE.  
 "An eloquent plea on moral and economical grounds for simplicity of life."—*Academy*.
25. **The Land and the Labourers.** Rev. C. W. STUBBS, M.A.  
 "This admirable book should be circulated in every village in the country."—*Manchester Guardian*.
26. **The Evolution of Property.** PAUL LAFARGUE.  
 "Will prove interesting and profitable to all students of economic history."—*Scotsman*.
27. **Crime and its Causes.** W. DOUGLAS MORRISON.  
 "Can hardly fail to suggest to all readers several new and pregnant reflections on the subject."—*Anti-Jacobin*.
- ✓ 28. **Principles of State Interference.** D. G. RITCHIE, M.A.  
 "An interesting contribution to the controversy on the functions of the State."—*Glasgow Herald*.
29. **German Socialism and F. Lassalle.** W. H. DAWSON.  
 "As a biographical history of German Socialistic movements during this century it may be accepted as complete."—*British Weekly*.
30. **The Purse and the Conscience.** H. M. THOMPSON, B.A. (Cantab.).  
 "Shows common sense and fairness in his arguments."—*Scotsman*.
31. **Origin of Property in Land.** FUSTEL DE COULANGES. Edited, with an Introductory Chapter on the English Manor, by Prof. W. J. ASHLEY, M.A.  
 "His views are clearly stated, and are worth reading."—*Saturday Review*.
32. **The English Republic.** W. J. LINTON. Edited by KINETON PARKES.  
 "Characterised by that vigorous intellectuality which has marked his long life of literary and artistic activity."—*Glasgow Herald*.
33. **The Co-Operative Movement.** BEATRICE POTTER.  
 "Without doubt the ablest and most philosophical analysis of the Co-Operative Movement which has yet been produced."—*Speaker*.
34. **Neighbourhood Guilds.** Dr. STANTON COIT.  
 "A most suggestive little book to any one interested in the social question."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
35. **Modern Humanism.** J. M. ROBERTSON.  
 "Mr. Robertson's style is excellent—nay, even brilliant—and his purely literary criticisms bear the mark of much acumen."—*Times*.
36. **Outlooks from the New Standpoint.** E. BELFORT BAX.  
 "Mr. Bax is a very acute and accomplished student of history and economics."—*Daily Chronicle*.
37. **Distributing Co-Operative Societies.** Dr. LUIGI PIZZAMIGLIO. Edited by F. J. SNELL.  
 "Dr. Pizzamiglio has gathered together and grouped a wide array of facts and statistics, and they speak for themselves."—*Speaker*.
- ✓ 38. **Collectivism and Socialism.** By A. NACQUET. Edited by W. HEAFORD.  
 "An admirable criticism by a well-known French politician of the New Socialism of Marx and Lassalle."—*Daily Chronicle*.
39. **The London Programme.** SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B.  
 "Brimful of excellent ideas."—*Anti-Jacobin*.
40. **The Modern State.** PAUL LEROY BEAULIEU.  
 "A most interesting book; well worth a place in the library of every social inquirer."—*N. B. Economist*.
41. **The Condition of Labour.** HENRY GEORGE.  
 "Written with striking ability, and sure to attract attention."—*Newcastle Chronicle*.
42. **The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the French Revolution.** FELIX ROCQUAIN. With a Preface by Professor HUXLEY.  
 "The student of the French Revolution will find in it an excellent introduction to the study of that catastrophe."—*Scotsman*.
43. **The Student's Marx.** EDWARD AVELING, D.Sc.  
 "One of the most practically useful of any in the Series."—*Glasgow Herald*.
44. **A Short History of Parliament.** B. C. SKOTTOWE, M.A. (Oxon.).  
 "Deals very carefully and completely with this side of constitutional history."—*Spectator*.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(Continued).

45. **Poverty: Its Genesis and Exodus.** J. G. GODARD.  
"He states the problems with great force and clearness."—*N. B. Economist*.
46. **The Trade Policy of Imperial Federation.** MAURICE H. HERVEY.  
"An interesting contribution to the discussion."—*Publishers' Circular*.
47. **The Dawn of Radicalism.** J. BOWLES DALY, LL.D.  
"Forms an admirable picture of an epoch more pregnant, perhaps, with political instruction than any other in the world's history."—*Daily Telegraph*.
48. **The Destitute Alien in Great Britain.** ARNOLD WHITE; MONTAGUE CRACKANTHORPE, Q.C.; W. A. M'ARTHUR, M.P.; W. H. WILKINS, &c.  
"Much valuable information concerning a burning question of the day."—*Times*.
49. **Illegitimacy and the Influence of Seasons on Conduct.** ALBERT LEFFINGWELL, M.D.  
"We have not often seen a work based on statistics which is more continuously interesting."—*Westminster Review*.
50. **Commercial Crises of the Nineteenth Century.** H. M. HYNDMAN.  
"One of the best and most permanently useful volumes of the Series."—*Literary Opinion*.
51. **The State and Pensions in Old Age.** J. A. SPENDER and ARTHUR ACLAND, M.P.  
"A careful and cautious examination of the question."—*Times*.
52. **The Fallacy of Saving.** JOHN M. ROBERTSON.  
"A plea for the reorganisation of our social and industrial system."—*Speaker*.
53. **The Irish Peasant.** ANON.  
"A real contribution to the Irish Problem by a close, patient and dispassionate investigator."—*Daily Chronicle*.
54. **The Effects of Machinery on Wages.** Prof. J. S. NICHOLSON, D.Sc.  
"Ablly reasoned, clearly stated, impartially written."—*Literary World*.
55. **The Social Horizon.** ANON.  
"A really admirable little book, bright, clear, and unconventional."—*Daily Chronicle*.
56. **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.** FREDERICK ENGELS.  
"The body of the book is still fresh and striking."—*Daily Chronicle*.
57. **Land Nationalisation.** A. R. WALLACE.  
"The most instructive and convincing of the popular works on the subject."—*National Reformer*.
58. **The Ethic of Usury and Interest.** Rev. W. BLISSARD.  
"The work is marked by genuine ability."—*North British Agriculturalist*.
59. **The Emancipation of Women.** ADELE CREPAZ.  
"By far the most comprehensive, luminous, and penetrating work on this question that I have yet met with."—*Extract from Mr. GLADSTONE's Preface*.
60. **The Eight Hours' Question.** JOHN M. ROBERTSON.  
"A very cogent and sustained argument on what is at present the unpopular side."—*Times*.
61. **Drunkenness.** GEORGE R. WILSON, M.B.  
"Well written, carefully reasoned, free from cant, and full of sound sense."—*National Observer*.
62. **The New Reformation.** RAMSDEN BALMFORTH.  
"A striking presentation of the nascent religion, how best to realize the personal and social ideal."—*Westminster Review*.
63. **The Agricultural Labourer.** T. E. KEBBEL.  
"A short summary of his position, with appendices on wages, education, allotments, etc., etc."
64. **Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer.** E. BERNSTEIN.  
"A worthy addition to the Social Science Series"—*North British Economist*.
65. **England's Foreign Trade in XIXth Century.** A. L. BOWLEY.  
"Full of valuable information, carefully compiled."—*Times*.
66. **Theory and Policy of Labour Protection.** Dr. SCHÄFFLE.  
"An attempt to systematize a conservative programme of reform."—*Man Guard*.
67. **History of Rochdale Pioneers.** G. J. HOLYOAKE.  
"Brought down from 1844 to the Rochdale Congress of 1892."—*Co-Op. News*.
68. **Rights of Women.** M. OSTRAGORSKI.  
"An admirable storehouse of precedents, conveniently arranged."—*Daily Chron.*
69. **Dwellings of the People.** LOCKE WORTHINGTON.  
"A valuable contribution to one of the most pressing problems of the day."—*Daily Chronicle*.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(Continued).

70. **Hours, Wages, and Production.** Dr. BRENTANO.  
"Characterised by all Professor Brentano's clearness of style."—*Economic Review*.
71. **Rise of Modern Democracy.** CH. BORGEAUD.  
"A very useful little volume, characterised by exact research."—*Daily Chronicle*.
72. **Land Systems of Australasia.** WM. EPPS.  
"Exceedingly valuable at the present time of depression and difficulty."—*Scots. Mag.*
- ✓ 73. **The Tyranny of Socialism.** YVES GUYOT. Pref. by J. H. LEVY.  
"M. Guyot is smart, lively, trenchant, and interesting."—*Daily Chronicle*.
74. **Population and the Social System.** Dr. NITII.  
"A very valuable work of an Italian economist."—*West. Rev.*
75. **The Labour Question.** T. G. SPYERS.  
"Will be found extremely useful."—*Times*.
76. **British Freewomen.** C. C. STOPES.
77. **Suicide and Insanity.** Dr. J. K. STRAHAN.
78. **A History of Tithes.** Rev. H. W. CLARKE.
79. **Three Months in a Workshop.** P. GOHRE, with Pref. by Prof. ELY.
80. **Darwinism and Race Progress.** Prof. J. B. HAYCRAFT.
81. **Local Taxation and Finance.** G. H. BLUNDEN.
82. **Perils to British Trade.** E. BURGIS.
83. **The Social Contract.** J. J. ROUSSEAU. Edited by H. J. TOZER.
84. **Labour upon the Land.** Edited by J. A. HOBSON, M.A.
85. **Moral Pathology.** ARTHUR E. GILES, M.D., B.Sc.
86. **Parasitism, Organic and Social.** MASSART and VANDERVELDE.
87. **Allotments and Small Holdings.** J. L. GREEN.
88. **Money and its Relations to Prices.** L. L. PRICE.
89. **Sober by Act of Parliament.** F. A. MACKENZIE.
90. **Workers on their Industries.** F. W. GALTON.
91. **Revolution and Counter-Revolution.** KARL MARX.
92. **Over-Production and Crises.** K. ROBERTUS.
93. **Local Government and State Aid.** S. J. CHAPMAN.
94. **Village Communities in India.** B. H. BADEN-POWELL, M.A., C.I.E.
95. **Anglo-American Trade.** S. J. CHAPMAN.
- ✓ 96. **A Plain Examination of Socialism.** GUSTAVE SIMONSON, M.A., M.D.
97. **Commercial Federation & Colonial Trade Policy.** J. DAVIDSON, M.A., Phil.D.
98. **Selections from Fourier** C. GIDE and J. FRANKLIN.
99. **Public-House Reform.** A. N. CUMMING.
100. **The Village Problem.** G. F. MILLIN.
101. **Toward the Light.** L. H. BERENS.
102. **Christian Socialism in England.** A. V. WOODWORTH.
103. **The Philosophers and the French Revolution.** Prof. P. A. WADIA.
104. **The History of the English Corn Laws.** Prof. J. S. NICHOLSON, M.A.
105. **The Biology of British Politics.** CHARLES H. HARVEY.
106. **Rates and Taxes as Affecting Agriculture.** Prof. J. S. NICHOLSON, M.A.
107. **A Practical Programme for Working Men.** EDMOND KELLY.

### DOUBLE VOLUMES, 3s. 6d.

1. **Life of Robert Owen.** LLOYD JONES.
- ✓ 2. **The Impossibility of Social Democracy : a Second Part of "The Quintessence of Socialism".** Dr. A. SCHÄFFLE.
3. **Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.** FREDERICK ENGELS.
4. **The Principles of Social Economy.** YVES GUYOT.
5. **Social Peace.** G. VON SCHULTZE-GAEVERNITZ.
- ✓ 6. **A Handbook of Socialism.** W. D. P. BLISS.
- ✓ 7. **Socialism : its Growth and Outcome.** W. MORRIS and E. B. BAX.
8. **Economic Foundations of Society.** A. LORIA.

SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO. LIM., LONDON  
NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIB'

Los Angeles

This book is DUE

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES

LIBRARY

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**AA** 000 959 367 4

